THE

MODERN CHURCHMAN

By identifying the new learning with heresy, you make orthodoxy synonymous with ignorance.—*Erasmus.*

A State without the means of change is without the means of its conservation.—*Edmund Burke.*

No. 3. JUNE, 1928. Vol. XVIII.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES

The Deposited Book and its Prospects.

The Church authorities are resolved to present the Deposited Book to Parliament in the near future. What will happen then? Opinion among Modernists is divided. Many think it best that the Book, although they heartily dislike some things in it, should be legalized, and the Bishops be given the opportunity of justifying their promises that if the Book be legalized, they will restore order and check decisively the Romeward movement. Others are of opinion that the authorizing of the Deposited Book will give a great impetus to the Romeward movement, and that if the episcopate were, as a whole, really resolved to restore liturgical order and check the Romeward movement, they could do it, as the Bishop of Birmingham is doing it, with their present powers.

The claim that the legalizing of the Deposited Book will procure peace for the Church makes the strongest appeal to all Modernists; there seems, however, to be very little to justify the hope. Although great concessions to Anglo-Catholics have been made in the Deposited Book, yet Anglo-Catholics are very far from satisfied, and without their being satisfied peace is impossible. Their goal is reunion with Rome, which can only be bought at the price of submission to Rome, and the exclusion of Evangelicals and Modernists from the English Church. Formerly we were told that if only the authorities would give to our Anglo-Catholic brethren what Rome gives her members in the way of Catholic teaching, Catholic worship, and Catholic privileges and practices, they would be content to remain Anglican. This has proved true in many cases, but there was one

condition not mentioned, namely, that the Church of England itself should finally enter the Papal obedience. The authorities of the English Church know that this can never be realised, but there are many Anglo-Catholics who believe it can, and it was their pressure which promoted and prolonged the Malines Conversations. We are sure then that whether the Deposited Book be legalized or rejected, peace will not ensue, and we are equally convinced that order will not be restored.

Is it then worth while to legalize the Deposited Book? There seems one sound reason for it being worth while. It might save a conflict between Church and State—at least in the near future. Of course, if the Anglo-Catholics get permanently into power such a conflict is bound to come sooner or later, unless the Crown surrenders the nomination of Bishops and the control over doctrine and practice which it exercises through the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. It is certain, however, that Modernists desire earnestly to avoid a conflict between Church and State, which would end in Disestablishment. They would, it is true, support Disestablishment accompanied by drastic Disendowment, rather than see the Romanizing of the National Church continue, but they could only regard this as a desperate remedy. For most Modernists the Disestablishment of the English Church would mean the cessation of all further interest in it. Disestablishment would be followed inevitably by Disruption, and we should have to look to other methods, organisations and institutions for the advancement of the Kingdom of God among the English people. Because Modernists desire to avoid the disaster of Disestablishment, they will be disposed to advocate the legalising of the Deposited Book. Could they feel convinced that the rejection of the Book would not lead to Disestablishment, they would, we believe, with few exceptions, favour its rejection, and the subsequent legalising of a non-controversial revision which would do something to procure peace, although it might not secure liturgical order.

The Home Secretary and the Deposited Book.

The Home Secretary's volume, *The Prayer Book Crisis*,* is a restrained and powerful indictment of the episcopal policy during the last quarter of a century. If it be hoped to pass the

* Published by Putnam, 2/6 net (1928).

Deposited Book through Parliament by means of the slogan, 'Trust the Bishops,' the Home Secretary's carefully collected and lucidly presented *data* will suggest the advisability of substituting for it 'Give peace in our time, O Lord.'

The Home Secretary, although he might be regarded as a conservative Evangelical, clearly recognizes the need for Prayer Book revision. He is not opposed to revision, but to the particular kind of revision proposed. He writes :—

> 'The Canadian Church revised its Prayer Book a few years ago. The Irish Church has done the same. But not in either case did they, under the plea of modernizing the book, restore elements which were deliberately discarded centuries ago, when the English Prayer Book was first compiled. As a consequence, there has been no popular excitement and no opposition to these revisions either in Canada or in Ireland' (p. 3).

Sir William Joynson-Hicks, in dealing with the Primate's figures indicating that the churches where continuous reservation is practised number over six hundred but under seven hundred, objects to the Primate's plea that this is only 'between $4\frac{1}{2}$ and 5 per cent. of the total number of churches in England.' This is so, but in 1904-6 the numbers, so far as can be ascertained, were between seventeen and thirty. At this rate of increase the practice will be universal in the English Church within the next forty years. *'May we not say of public worship, what Rome does to-day Canterbury will do to-morrow'* (p. 118.)

Although the Deposited Book will not necessarily replace the existing Prayer Book, yet if the parish priest can secure the support of his bishop, he can introduce it even though his parishioners be opposed to his doing so. Sir William is quite rightly much perturbed by this :

> 'The Bishop of St. Albans said, in the Church Assembly in April, that the word "inform" in the rubric directing that the incumbent shall inform his Parochial Church Council before making changes, must not be taken as meaning "obtain the consent of." To make this clear he used an illustration which is more characteristic than graceful : "If I 'inform' a man that he is a silly fool, that does not mean that I am asking his assent to the proposition" ' (p. 141).

We hope that the Bishops will give a pledge in Parliament that they will never consent to any change of this kind to which the majority of the Parochial Church Council are opposed.

Sir William, like the Dean of St. Paul's, is of opinion that the Anglo-Catholic movement has been a source of weakness rather than of strength to the English Church. He writes :

> 'There is one thing with regard to the Anglo-Catholic movement which is kept out of sight as a rule, and that is its complete failure. . . . What is the result . . . after fifty years? *The Official Year Book of the Church of England* gives in part the answer so far as statistics go, and the mournful preface to a recent issue of *Crockford's Clerical Directory* tells the same tale' (p. 151).

There is a serious falling-off in church attendance, and a steady decline in the number of Ordinands, candidates for Confirmation, and Sunday School scholars. In the London Diocese, the most Anglo-Catholic of all, the Church, notwithstanding its great resources, is growing rapidly weaker.

> 'When the elections of the Church Assembly came to depend on the numbers on the Electoral Rolls, that is of avowed Church people and not on a basis of population, the representation of the Diocese in the Assembly fell from thirty-nine to seventeen' (p. 152).

It is not just to attribute this entirely to the introduction of mediaeval doctrine and worship. The causes are many. A conservative Evangelicalism is one of them.

The Home Secretary regards the threat of Disestablishment, if the Deposited Book be rejected, as negligible. He writes:

> 'I am convinced that the passing of the Revised Book would be more likely than its rejection to lead to Disestablishment. There has, however, been very little response anywhere to suggestions of this kind. Very few people in the country want Disestablishment . . . But have those Bishops who talk of Disestablishment, because Parliament refuses them permission to undermine the Reformation Settlement, fully considered what it would involve? Do they suppose that Parliament would hand over to them and to the Anglo-Catholic section of the clergy the great revenues of the parish churches and the cathedrals, which belong to the people of this country and exist for their benefit, when they are driven out of them by alien and repugnant doctrines and ceremonial?' (p. 154).

The Home Secretary goes to the root of the matter when he touches upon the rights of the laity.

> 'The Bishops are not the Church, nor are they and the clergy the "spirituality" of the Church, nor have they an "inherent" authority to define and declare the doctrines of the Church. The laity are as much as the clergy "spiritual persons," for "if any man have not the Spirit of Christ he is none of His." And it seems to me not a bad thing, but a good, that Parliament should discuss spiritual and religious questions. I thank God for the reverent, earnest and considerate spirit in which the question of the Prayer Book was debated in the Houses of Parliament in December last. History records the proceedings of many Church Councils which compare very unfavourably with it' (p. 155).

It was the deep conviction that these rights have been flouted which led the House of Commons to reject the Deposited Book. To this conviction must be added another, namely, that the

House of Commons more truly represents the great mass of the English laity than does the Church Assembly or the Diocesan Conferences. If the Book is again rejected, these will be the reasons for its rejection. The House will thereby be making no claim to represent the State in opposition to the Church, but to represent the great mass of the English laity largely unrepresented and but feebly articulate in the ecclesiastical governing bodies.

The Need for a New Church Calendar.

The well-known English Churchman, Colonel Turton, suggested in *Theology* (January, 1928), that where fresh Saints are inserted in our English Calendar that of Lugalama should be included. Lugalama was the youngest of three boys, the first martyrs in Uganda, who was slowly burnt alive on January 30th, 1885. As a *boy* Saint, a *modern* Saint, and a *coloured* Saint, Colonel Turton holds it would be profitable to canonize him. It might be done if January 30th is not claimed for the Decollation of Charles I. Our present Prayer Book Calendar of 1662 commemorates a good deal that is needless, *e.g.* The Invention of the Cross, Translation of Edward, King of the W. Saxons, St. Denys, Areopagite, Bishop and Martyr, Nativity of the Blessed Virgin, Conception of the Blessed Virgin, St. Anne, Mother of the Blessed Virgin Mary, Translation of St. Martin, Richard, Bishop of Chichester, Nicolas, Bishop of Myra in Lycia, and a number of others. These commemorations are either fictitious, or superstitious, or both.

When we turn to the Revised Calendar of 1927 we are disappointed. The opportunities were vast; the use made of them exiguous. This has not escaped the critical eye of the Home Secretary. Having commented on the insertion of the Commemoration of All Souls' as 'a festival from the Roman Calendar which is rooted in the Romish doctrine of Purgatory,' he writes:

> 'The Calendar is, moreover, an illustration of the fact that the new Prayer Book is not, as is claimed by some of its supporters, a bringing up to date of the old one. In it there are some twenty-nine names or commemorations not in our present book, the great majority of them taken from the Roman Calendar; but the latest of these is "Catherine of Siena, Virgin, 1380." Anskar of Sweden is added and Pope Leo the Great, Anthony of Egypt, and Bernard of Clairvaux; but no single name connected with Reformation or post-Reformation

> times : not Cranmer, whose work in the main the Prayer Book is, nor William Tyndale, who gave us the first printed English New Testament, nor Ridley, nor Latimer, whose names are more familiar to and better known by English Church people than the pre-Reformation saints and worthies who are recorded. It is, too, very remarkable that among mediaeval names that of John Wycliffe, the first translator of the Bible into English, who was of the same century as Catherine of Siena, has been left out. But John Wycliffe was excommunicated by the Pope and, with reunion in view, it might not have done to add his name ' (p. 134).

It may have escaped the Home Secretary's eye that November 8 is assigned to ' Saints, Martyrs, and Doctors of the Church of England.' Perhaps, like the £10 Lord Chesterfield sent to Dr. Johnson, the Home Secretary regarded this recognition of our latter-day English worthies as too scant to demand mention. Certainly the latest revision and enrichment of our Calendar does suggest a combination of timidity and reaction. Besides the names suggested by Sir William Joynson-Hicks, the Calendar of our National Church ought to contain such names as those of Dean Colet, Sir Thomas More, Richard Hooker, Sir Philip Sidney, Richard Baxter, John Bunyan, George Fox, Bishop Ken, Bishop Butler, William Law, John Wesley, Henry Martin, Reginald Heber, Samuel Marsden, Bishop Patteson, George Augustus Selwyn, Joseph Addison, George Herbert, John Keble, Dr. Arnold, Josephine Butler, F. D. Maurice, Samuel Johnson, General Booth, Elizabeth Fry, David Livingstone, and many others. The whole conception of saintship needs humanizing and modernizing. It is too closely associated in the minds of many with rigid orthodoxy, asceticism, unhistorical miracles, and conventional piety. Of these it should be purged. There are many unorthodox saints, non-ascetic saints, anti-ecclesiastical saints, that our Church ought to commemorate for the education, example, and inspiration of her members. Even the inclusion in our calendar of a few saintly heresiarchs and schismatics might not be at all a bad thing. The Church owes them much for their contributions to Christian thought and diversity. If we cannot do better in the way of a Church Calendar than 1662 and 1927, it would be as well to return to the Calendar of 1549 which eliminated all the Black Letter saints and commemorations, and to trust to our journalists and historians to remind us from time to time of the good and great whom we ought to remember with gratitude and reverence.

THINGS, PERSONS, AND GOD

By the Reverend E. J. Martin, D.D.

THE Christian East, the organ of Anglican sympathy with the Oriental Churches, related in September, 1924 (apparently in good faith), the following incident: A serious forest fire broke out in that year in the neighbourhood of the monastery of Khiliandari in Mt. Athos; 'the monks in despair of all human aid, brought out their most sacred eikon, Our Lady of the Three Hands, and put it in the path of the fire. On the instant the wind changed, the fire was driven . . . back on the already devastated area where it soon went out for lack of fuel.' The implied belief in a divinity inherent in the eikon throws the mind back to the curious theology of the Iconoclastic Controversy of the eighth and ninth centuries. It raises then the extremely important question of the inter-relation of Things, Persons, and the Divine. Orthodoxy in the early ninth century by the voice of Theodore of Studium declared that a picture stood to its original as a shadow to its substance. Original and picture are separable in accidents (*τῷ τῆς οὐσίας λόγῳ*) but not in substance (*ὑποστατικῶς*). The original is actually present in the picture. (*πῶς οὐχὶ ἐν τῇ εἰκόνι ὁ εἰκονιζόμενος ὁμωνύμως ὁρᾶται τε καὶ εἶναι πιστεύεται;*). And with perfect logic Theodore commended a correspondent for making the image of St. Demetrius sponsor for his child at baptism.[1]

The larger question that lies behind is whether inanimate objects can be endowed with the Divine. The point has been touched upon by C. W. Emmet in *The Psychology of Grace*.[2] He suggested that inanimate objects could be material for symbolism only, and that a legitimate symbolism should be based on association of the symbol with Christ. Thus the Lord's Supper or a visit to the Holy Land would legitimately be a means of bringing grace to the faithful because of their associations. But a holy relic is an illegitimate symbol because it implies an independent indwelling of the divine, a *mana*, apart from any association.

It might be a simplification of the problem to base it on the

[1] *Theod. Stud. Ep.* II, 199; I, 17.

[2] In Streeter, *The Spirit*, London, 1921.

interrelation of Things, Persons, and the Divine. By a Person we mean an ego, a separate existence, self-directed from within, capable of turning its thoughts inward upon itself. A Thing, though separately existing, so far as we know, has no awareness or self-consciousness. It is directed mostly from without. Its self-direction is either far more limited than a Person's, as in the example of a growing plant, or it is all but non-existent, as with a crystal. Does or can the Divine energize indifferently alike through Person and Thing? Primitive religion says Yes. A stone may be the dwelling-place of a spirit, malevolent or kindly. So primitive Hebraism saw the Divine localized in the Ark. But Hebrew religion moved forward to the stage of believing that spirit required at least an animate, if not a human, object for its host. The Gadarene demons had the alternative of entering the swine or being at large in the Void. They could not apparently inhabit a tree or a stone. This may be accepted as a fair representation of common Jewish belief. Orthodox Judaism saw the Divine as essentially outside the world. The earth was the work of God's hands, but heaven was His dwelling-place. Upon this view broke in the idea of the Incarnation, the idea that the Divine might dwell in human life. But the Hebrew background remained with primitive Christianity. Heaven was still God's throne. An early, if not the earliest, example of the irruption into Christianity of the novel idea of inanimate Nature, not as God's work, but as God's dwelling, is found in the Oxyrhynchus Logion : *Raise the stone and thou shalt find me, cleave the wood and I am there.* To us this is a familiar thought, for we have inherited the results of the reign of sentiment set up by the Romantic Revival. We are quite ready to say without thought :

'I found Him in the light of setting suns.'

In sober fact, however, we only found Him there because we had brought Him with us.

God in Nature is the reflection of man's mind upon objects which have been invested with the Divine by a symbolical significance men have given them. God speaks to man, but it is a convention of man's that has made Nature interpreter to God. Canon Quick has said something like this about the Sacraments. The Sacraments do not pour spiritual gifts into the soul from without as one pours water into a jar; the spiritual cannot be

put into a man at all, it must be drawn out of him.[3] What gives meaning to the Sacraments is not a relationship between God and the symbol, but a relationship between the worshippers and the symbol plus a relationship between the worshippers and God. Accordingly the Church Catechism accurately defines the matter of the Sacrament of Baptism not as water but as water-wherein-the-person-is-baptized, etc., and the matter of the Eucharist as Bread - and -Wine - which - the -Lord-hath-commanded-to-be-received (sc. by the worshippers). In both cases matter is contemplated only in conjunction with persons, who by their use of the Things give the Sacraments their content. A Divine Presence does not rest in Things but in the Persons who use the Things. In the Christian scheme, while Things may be set apart for a sacred use, they cannot themselves be infused with the Divine. The Holy Table is set apart for a solemn purpose, but it can have none of the inherent sanctity the primitive Hebrews attributed to the Ark. The Host is bread set apart for a sacred rite, but it cannot have the inherent divine power that mediaeval superstition supposed. Outside the act of Communion it has no significance, and reservation of the Sacrament except for Communion can have no legitimate meaning.

The Christian idea seems to be that the Divine works in *men* —ἐνεργεῖ—co-operatively, because in man there is something that has affinity to the Divine, and can work with it. The Divine does not work in Things because in Things there is no Divine affinity. If Things are employed as symbols to mediate the Divine, it is because men have some reasons for recognizing the symbol. There is no symbol except by agreed convention. And in no case can the symbol be more than symbol. It cannot work *proprio motu*, nor can it possess power in itself.

It has become almost an accepted commonplace to speak of Sacraments as the extension of the Incarnation. Nothing could be more wide of the mark. The Incarnation is the perfect method of mediating the Divine—through a living personality, who by spontaneous co-ordination of will (I come to do Thy will, O God) achieves what Humanity has in it to be. But the Sacraments are altogether a different mode. There is no resemblance or connection between the revelation of God in a living Being

[3] See Quick, O.C., *The Christian Sacraments*; London, 1927; especially pp. 113, 115, 118.

and a revelation through inanimate matter. It is futile to seek the living among the dead. Sacraments, so far from being an extension of the Incarnation, belong to another order of religious expression. They belong to the conventional order, the order which depends for its efficacy on the attendant minds of men. The Incarnation belongs to the order of Reality, spirit spontaneously expressing itself in spirit, life reaching out to life, energy acting on other energy. The Incarnation belongs to the animate world to which Man belongs, sacraments belong to a lower world that gets its reality from Man.

If we ask the question: Does God work through mere Things? the answer is, No. He works only in Persons. Those Persons may use Things symbolically to assist their reach towards the Divine. Strictly there cannot be even Holy Things; there can be only Holy Men. Things may be sacred, but it is only men who can ever be sanctified. The Holy Spirit is the Lord and Giver of Life. The Spirit does not vitalize what is by its nature incapable of life.

BIBLICAL FILMS

SOME OBSERVATIONS ON *THE KING OF KINGS*.

By the Rev. G. W. Butterworth, M.A., Litt.D.

IT appears likely that the Bible will be increasingly used as material for the films. Writers of film 'dramas' ransack the world's literature for stories of human interest, such as are calculated to appeal widely when presented on the screen. The Bible is a rich mine of such stories, and it would be folly to suppose that it would be left untouched for fear of hurting the feelings of religious people. Nor need we desire that it should be. But important questions arise when the Bible stories, particularly those from the Gospels, are filmed; for these films have a world-wide circulation, and may prove a potent educational influence on undeveloped minds. Bible films can never be mere stories, like the adventures of Odysseus or Robin Hood. They are bound to convey the suggestion that they are expressing the religious ideas of Christianity. If they could do this truly, they might be of great service to religion; if they do it falsely, they may become a serious hindrance.

No doubt some will object to all Biblical films on the ground

that the sacredness of the Bible is violated by the use of its stories for film purposes. Such objections, however sincerely felt, will not be heeded. So long as the producers can make a film sufficiently interesting for the public to wish to see it, that film will in the long run be shown, whatever its subject. Mere opposition will do no good. But reasonable criticism may be taken into account and may assist in eliminating certain harmful features. At the present time much discussion has raged around a recent film, *The King of Kings*, which takes for its subject the life and passion of Jesus Christ. This is the heart of the Christian religion, and on that account the film invites comment from a Christian point of view.

Granting that the Gospel story may be fitly presented on the screen, what rules should govern its presentation? The story should of course be depicted with a reverence befitting its deep solemnity. It should be reasonably faithful to the facts, so far as these are known with certainty, and in any case it should not contradict them in important particulars. Needless to say also, its artistic merits should be high; any serious lapse in taste will spoil both the reverence and the faithfulness. These are little more than the requirements which ought to be made of any historical film. There are, in fact, no peculiar canons for the production of a Biblical film, any more than there are for the investigation of a book of the Bible. A serious aim and a keen desire to express the truth in the worthiest way possible are all that need be demanded.

The producers of *The King of Kings* make a definite claim along these lines for their work. It is, they tell us, a reverent attempt to portray the Gospel story. More than that, it is meant to be a missionary work. Jesus, they say, wished His message to be preached in all the world, and this film claims to take a humble share in that great task. We need not quarrel with them so far as the intention of being reverent is concerned. Clearly the performers take their work seriously and are conscious of the unique character of Jesus. In some ways this seriousness seems almost to have weighed upon them and to have spread an atmosphere of heaviness not only over the Passion story, where it is natural and inevitable, but also over the rather short scenes from the Galilean ministry. The figure of Jesus, in particular, is somewhat solid and immobile. There is evidently a nervous-

ness lest he should lose dignity, and accordingly he does very little. Occasionally he is allowed to smile, but passages such as that which describe his anger in the Synagogue or his rebuke to St. Peter are discreetly omitted. Everyone will recognize how heart-breaking a task it must be to picture the Jesus of the Gospels in all the aspects of his many-sided character. Little wonder if this attempt is unsuccessful, as it certainly is. But it is impossible to say that the picture is irreverently drawn.

A word may be said here on the subject of pecuniary profit. There is no reason why the producers of a Biblical film should not receive a reward for their services, precisely as clergy, organists and church-builders do. If a film is produced for profit and nothing else it will be a bad film, whether religious or secular in subject. The evil of commercialism certainly does enter largely into the production of films to-day, but it enters also into the theatre, the press and other things in themselves good. It always shows itself in a marked tendency to give the public what the public wants and so to ensure financial success, irrespective of higher aims. Now the public wants a certain amount of religion, of a sentimental type, and it is ready to pay for a presentation of such religion on the films. *The King of Kings* cannot claim to have ignored the public demand, and yet it panders to it less than might have been expected. Taking it as a whole the work gives no ground for the charge that it was done with an eye to profit alone.

We turn, then, to the question of historical faithfulness. Have we here the true Gospel story? The producers claim that we have. The programme speaks as follows:

> 'The Bible has been very closely followed, and in the few instances where Mr. De Mille has added to the Gospel narrative, he has almost always had the authority of early Christian legend and tradition.'

This is a bold claim, and one is at a loss to know exactly what 'few instances' are referred to. The only suggestion of early Christian tradition that I could detect was the appearance of Mark, who as a boy is healed of lameness by Jesus in Galilee and thenceforward hovers on the outskirts of the apostolic company. It may be that we have here an attempt to connect Mark with the Gospel narrative made by someone who has heard a vague account of the Christian tradition concerning him. But the Mark here pictured is a ragged urchin of Galilee, whereas the historical Mark was the son of a well-to-do lady of Jeru-

salem. And Christian tradition is contradicted when the film makes Mark an eye-witness of the ministry of Jesus, which Papias distinctly says that he was not. The ragged urchin is a pathetic figure, invented in order to appeal to the sentiment of the multitude, but historically he is a mistake.

There is still less justification for the liberties taken with Mary Magdalene and Judas. We cannot at this time of day rescue Mary Magdalene from her identification with the woman who was a sinner, for this is indeed a Christian tradition, though a most unhappy one. But there appears to be nothing either in history or in legend to associate Judas with her. Yet in gross disregard of truth this film opens with a gorgeous palace-scene in which Mary, the rich courtesan of Magdala, is surrounded by a crowd of elderly and unattractive admirers. She is pining for Judas, who has deserted her to become a disciple of the 'carpenter of Nazareth.' Nobody, she declares, shall keep her from her lover, and she drives off in hot haste with a team of zebras to encounter Jesus. The whole scene is fantastic and childish, clearly designed for a public which demands to see pictures of extravagant luxury and to be stimulated by the sex-motive. Once face to face with Jesus, Mary succumbs in a few moments. The thing is psychologically unreal, besides being historically false.

It will perhaps be urged that the gaps in the Gospel story have to be filled in somehow, and that this is an intelligible method of filling them in. This may appear plausible to those whose knowledge of the Gospels is only superficial. Others will find that this scene jars upon them. That Jesus changed many a sinful life into a holy one is beyond question; but this truth would be far more evident if presented in a less artificial setting and if some time were allowed for His teaching and example to produce its full effect. A study in the conversion of a degraded life through his noble influence would be of great value, provided the story were told naturally and without the suggestion of a power that is rather magical than spiritual.

Novelists and dramatists who describe well-known historical persons would, I think, agree that their works should illustrate the characters of these persons and not alter them. The necessary filling-up should conform to the type already given in history. This is a moral question. People who are dead cannot

defend themselves, and we have no right to saddle them with vices of which they may never have been guilty. Now Judas comes down to us with one sufficiently serious sin to his charge. By itself it is quite enough for him to bear. On what ground can we add other sins, picturing him as being licentious as well as treacherous? For all we know, he may have been the soul of purity from first to last. His act of treachery is hard to explain, and many have attempted to discover motives to account for it. All this is legitimate enough; but to associate him, as this film does, with Mary Magdalene in her unreformed days is not legitimate. Moreover it fulfils no function except that of bringing Mary to Jesus, an act which could have been accomplished in a hundred better ways; and at the same time it creates additional difficulties, for one has to imagine Mary and Judas living in close company as members of the little band that looked to Jesus as their Master.

It would be easy to point to many other less serious discrepancies. Those familiar with the Gospel story will constantly find slight changes introduced into the film version for no apparent reason. If the dramatic quality of the story were thereby intensified these changes might be permissible. But this is not the case. We have a right to ask that film writers should treat the Gospels with more than ordinary respect. They are works of art and the incidents recorded in them are described with deep poetic and dramatic inspiration. They lend themselves as a rule quite easily to pictorial representation, and there is no need to alter them or to join two entirely separate incidents together or to transfer a scene from Galilee to Jerusalem or *vice versa*. People to whom the Gospels are unknown will not of course observe these changes. But others will be apprehensive of the danger that may ensue if anybody is allowed to tamper with the stories as he thinks fit and then to present the result on the screen before the eyes of millions, many of them young and many others incapable of forming a correct judgment on the pictures so presented. If to-day's tendency in multitudes of people is to read less of serious literature including the Bible, and to see more and more through the medium of the screen, we may quite well find the very text of the Gospels becoming an unknown thing, or what is perhaps worse, a mis-known thing, except to a small minority of Christians.

An example of the lengths to which this licence may go is to be found in the earthquake which accompanies the Crucifixion. We cannot complain of the introduction of the earthquake itself, since this forms part of St. Matthew's story of the Passion; but we may reasonably say that the opening of the tombs and the appearance of the spirits would to-day be regarded as legendary by the majority of competent scholars. Still, a nice discrimination of this sort is scarcely to be expected of a film-writer, and an earthquake undoubtedly offers great possibilities. Nevertheless there is really no connexion at all between the simple, dignified narrative of St. Matthew and the extraordinary scene shown on the film in which one chasm after another opens in the earth and hundreds, if not thousands, of innocent victims are swallowed up alive. What the beholder is supposed to feel at all this I do not know. If it is intended to inspire him with fear and awe it is a ludicrous failure. It might become, however, a very serious matter if this scene were to be shown in heathen lands where men would form from it an idea of the character of the God whom Christians worship.

These last words indicate the fundamental reasons for the hesitation felt by many in regard to the picturing of Gospel narratives on the films. The screen is a preacher and a most impressive one. It does not merely tell the Christian story from a detached point of view. It advocates a particular version of the Christian religion. Everything depends upon the character of that version. Now there is likely to be some conflict between the version which best suits the purposes of the screen and that which most thoughtful and educated men in these days accept. Of sentimentality and unfaithfulness to history I have already spoken. And there is another difference, perhaps more important still. Anything that savours of the miraculous, the startling and stupendous is gradually becoming for thoughtful men a burden and a difficulty; not of necessity an impossibility, but something to be scrutinized with care and brought into line, if possible, with known laws and events. When miracles are accepted stress is laid on the moral quality displayed in them, and not on the mere wonder. Now that which is an embarrassment to the Christian thinker is a distinct advantage to the film producer. Miracles can easily be worked on the screen by a little appropriate acting or by some simple technical device.

We shall find, therefore, that with the best will in the world those who make films from the Gospels will be tempted to overload their work with the miraculous. With the Gospels before us we cannot demand that the miraculous should be eliminated; but we must insist that miracle is by no means the more important part of them and that the appeal of Jesus to the human heart in every age, and especially in our own, rests upon His moral and spiritual excellence, His character and teaching. Miracles must ever be strictly subordinated to this.

What is needed is a judicious selection of incidents. The teaching of Jesus by the lake side and in the synagogue should be pictured. His disputes with the Pharisees about the Sabbath and the Law should be included, and briefly explained in the captions. The call and training of the disciples should be indicated, and the conflicts of will and purpose between them and Jesus should be shown. Otherwise they become lifeless figures, as they are for the most part in this film, where even St. Peter can only be brought into prominence by being made a physical giant. There is scope for the imagination in picturing how the 'Sons of Thunder' and the 'Zealot' were transformed into leaders of the Christian Church. To illustrate the teaching of Jesus, parables like the Prodigal Son and the Good Samaritan might be shown in dramatic form, and it should not be impossible to represent some of the Johannine teaching. All this is missing from *The King of Kings*.

The scenes from the ministry concentrate attention largely on the miracles, although the blessing of the children is brought in. It must be admitted that a few of the miracles are presented with considerable beauty and tenderness. Too much, however, is made of the coin found in the fish's mouth, of which a most unconvincing picture is given. This is indeed the danger inherent in presenting miracles through this medium; it seems well-nigh impossible to make them convincing. The raising of Lazarus is a conspicuous example. In the midst of a large and lofty cave with many spectators, we are shown a stone coffin with a heavy lid. The lid is slowly raised, and we witness the gradual resuscitation of the dead man. If anyone has doubts about the historical character of the story this scene will certainly confirm them; whatever it was that happened, he will say, it

cannot have been *that*. A reading of Browning's Epistle of Kharshish, with its wise reticence about details and its wonderful spiritual suggestiveness, will almost turn a sceptic into an orthodox believer. Given a sufficient number of miracles shown on the screen, we could reckon to turn most thoughtful men into sceptics, at any rate in regard to a religion which is viewed as inseparable from the miraculous.

I have said nothing about the scenes of the Passion. Great care has been taken over them, and they are reverently performed. They are probably too long, and the short Resurrection scene at the close is not sufficient to remove the atmosphere of suffering. Opinions will differ about the wisdom of dwelling on the details of our Lord's sufferings. If the storm and the earthquake were removed and the trial scenes shortened, suggestion rather than actual representation being employed in regard to the scourging, the crown of thorns, and the Crucifixion itself, many would consider it an improvement. In any case the work might conclude not with the Ascension, but with some representation of Pentecost, and the Spirit of Jesus going forth in his disciples to conquer the world.

Is it too much to ask that those who contemplate making films from the Bible should seek advice from trustworthy Christian scholars? It would be unreasonable to expect that the question of popular acceptability should be entirely disregarded. More of the sentimental than the fastidious will approve of must probably be admitted into every film that is to make a good profit. But much could be done to render religious films of such a kind that thoughtful and cultivated men need not be ashamed of them. Their power for good is incalculable. To bring the Christian message in this vivid and unforgettable form before the eyes of all the world might indeed be a noble task. It will go hard, however, with Christianity if what the world sees is not the true religion but a poor counterfeit. The reduced attractiveness, from a popular point of view, of films prepared in reasonable accord with truth and good taste, will be balanced by the advantage of a longer life. A sensational film soon burns itself out; but there is no reason why a good one, thoughtfully conceived and well acted, should not prove a real work of art, worthy of being preserved and reproduced for many years.

CHRISTIAN REUNION AND THE PAPAL ENCYCLICAL

DURING the last few months many striking events have placed in a new perspective the questions (which have been agitating so many minds) as to what are the prospects or possibilities of a greater degree of unity amongst the Christian Churches.

This is a matter on which it is especially needful to avoid that form of exaggeration which comes of imagining the evils of our own age to be greater than those of other ages. After all, Christendom never has been a unity, and at some periods its chaotic condition has been such as to surpass anything of our own times. Lack of unity has characterized Christendom (taken as a whole) throughout the ages. In the fourth century (to go no earlier), the Arian controversies split the Church asunder, and, even after the Council of Nicaea, the strife proceeded. 'The air was full of wild and seductive systems of speculation; and individual Christians were diverging into strange opinions on all sides . . . "Our all is at stake," Athanasius truly said, in justification of his life-long conflict.'[1] Later, the heresy of Eutychianism seemed irrepressible. 'In spite of the Council of Chalcedon, Eutychianism remained powerful in the East, and supreme in Egypt.'[2] In the seventh century, 'the Greeks were engaged in the most bitter and virulent controversy with the Paulicians, whom they considered as a branch of the Manichaean sect . . . The dispute was carried to the greatest height under the reigns of Constans, Constantine Pogonatus, and Justinian II; and the Greeks were not only armed with arguments, but were also seconded by the force of military legions, and the terror of penal laws.'[3]

In the Middle Ages the appearance of things was different, owing to the supremacy of the Papacy: but this was so only in

[1] Dr. J. R. Illingworth, *Personality*, lecture 1.

[2] Dom J. Chapman, O.S.B., *The First Eight Councils and Papal Infallibility*, p. 44.

[3] Mosheim, *Church History* (trans. Maclaine), 1, 164.

Western Europe. The East was separated from the West, and the Crusaders, indeed, unmercifully pillaged the Imperial City of Constantinople. Even in the West itself, Albigensianism menaced the very life of the Church, and was repressed only after a frightful war. Europe seethed with strange heresies: the 'Poor Men of Lyons,' the Flagellants, the Petrobrussians, the Catharists, etc. The Lollards in England, and Hussites in Bohemia, agitated the minds of multitudes, and were suppressed (so far as they *were* suppressed) only by the stake and the dungeon. The Great Schism of the West (1378—1415) saw the 'visible unity' of the Western Church eclipsed by the rivalries of Popes and anti-Popes. Then came the Renascence, leading to the Reformation. No!—our modern difficulties are far from without parallel! Indeed, it may be argued that diversities which arise from the healthy growth of liberty of thought are preferable to a unity—however seemingly august—enforced by the denial of that liberty. 'Those sin most against true religion who try to convert men from the outside by mechanical means. They have the lie in the soul, being most ignorant of the nature of that for which they feel most deeply.'[4]

Nevertheless, it is a noble ideal—that of promoting greater unity among Christians. It is the ideal, indeed, expressed by the Founder of Christianity Himself, when He said: 'There shall be one flock and one shepherd.' The problem is not as to the nobility of the ideal, but as to the nature of the unity to be achieved, and how the achievement is to be accomplished. Is it to be a rigid outward uniformity, or rather an increasing co-operation in spirit and act, without exterior uniformity?

Since the Great War, there has been an increase of sympathy between the Eastern Churches and the Reformed Churches of the West. It is doubtful, however, whether such approaches will lead, at any rate for a long time, to anything very definite.

The attitude of the Orthodox East, before the War, towards Christians outside its communion, was thus stated in 1903 by the Holy Synod of Russia in a letter to the Patriarch of Constantinople: 'We show every possible condescension to their perplexities—natural after a separation so lengthy. But at the same time we proclaim vehemently the truth of our Church and

[4] L. T. Hobhouse, *Liberalism*, p. 30.

her office as the sole heir of Christ: the one Ark of Salvation which God's grace has left.' This position seems very similar to that of the Papacy. It is not very promising from the point of view of those desirous of union between any Reformed Church and the East!

It may be suggested, however, that the Great War has occurred since the foregoing declaration was made, and that the Orthodox outlook has altered. For example, there have been recognitions of the validity of Anglican Ordinations. Those recognitions, however, were *qualified*: Anglican Orders were recognized as being as valid 'as the Roman Orders.' That may mean little, or no, more than that Anglican Orders can be taken as valid *by economy* (to employ a well-known Orthodox phrase); and, in any case, it would no more lead to definite *reunion* than it would lead to that in the case of *Rome*. Moreover, it is impossible to overlook the long history of the attitude of the Orthodox East to the Reformation.

Many of the first Reformers made approaches to the East. Cranmer himself had it in view. Jacob Andreae and Martin Crusino corresponded with Jeremiah, Patriarch of Constantinople, with the idea of obtaining favour for Lutheranism. The result was *condemnation*, not approval. Cyril Lukaris, Patriarch of Constantinople between 1620 and 1638, endeavoured to introduce the Reformation into the Orthodox Church. He was assassinated, and, thereafter, Orthodox synods condemned the Protestant movement. The Synod of Jerusalem (1672) has been called 'the Orthodox Council of Trent.' It condemned doctrines such as those of Lukaris, and affirmed standards of uncompromising Orthodoxy: the veneration of saints; seven sacraments; the Real Presence; the Holy Liturgy a true Sacrifice; etc. All the Eastern Patriarchs, and the Russian Church, approved its decrees, which became a standard of belief. The fact still remains now essentially what it was when Archdeacon Sinclair[5] wrote in 1898 that 'the Eastern Church has undergone no process of development in doctrine like the Western since the seven General Councils. Its doctrines remain in the same rigid, yet undefined state as that in which they were left by Constantine and Justinian.'

[5] *The Churches of the East*, p. 47.

The Orthodox, it is true, participate in conferences such as that at Lausanne in 1927; and they are more 'approachable,' in the sense of friendly personal intercourse, than are the Latins. This, however, is very different from a lessening of *their dogmatic position*. They have not done *that*. They did not do it at Lausanne.

With regard to the Churches which, in the West, originated from or accepted the Reformation, what is the position as to 'reunion' amongst themselves?

The essence of the Reformation was the appeal from the authority of tradition to the freedom of the individual soul. 'The Reformation was, however unconsciously, both the first great triumph of the scientific spirit and a very effectual assertion of human liberty. It was brought about by the application of certain keen and independent minds to the study of theology: the Reformers, at the very moment that they were denouncing reason and proclaiming their unconditional submission to Scripture, were, in a very true sense, rationalists without knowing it. They had broken away from tradition, the schoolmen, the Church, and, with an audacity the extent of which we are now hardly abue to realize, had taken their religious fate into their own hands.'[6]

This being so, it follows that the outlook, and much of the attitude to life, of the Reformed Churches, must be the antithesis of that of the Churches (whether Orthodox or Latin) which did not accept the Reformation. The unreformed Churches are for tradition: the reformed must be for freedom: *must* be, or the basis of their life, since the sixteenth century, stands condemned. The fact that most of the first Reformers were highly dogmatic theologians, was a mere incident of their fight with the Papacy. They could not (being human) emancipate themselves fully, and they had to fight Rome on a basis of dogma. Their separation from the Papacy, however, could be justified logically only by the right of private judgment. Hence the Reformation, and the Churches which fell in with it cannot rely on tradition, but must rely on the freedom of the individual soul, and on tradition only as subject to that freedom. They cannot aim at rigid, dogmatic reunion.

[6] Charles Beard, *Lectures* (1883) *on the Reformation*, lect. 5.

This is obvious enough in regard to the Lutheran, Presbyterian, and other Churches which (as non-episcopal bodies) were founded at the Reformation. The *Anglican* Church, however, is a more complex problem. Though reformed, it maintained the episcopal succession from pre-Reformation times, and claims to be the same Church, in all essentials, as that of Lanfranc, Chicheley, and Augustine. 'No idea could be more repugnant to the intention and understanding of King Henry the Eighth and his Parliaments (as apparent from their repeated declarations and acts) than that of either creating a new Church, or "reconstructing" the old.'[7] In the reigns of Edward VI and Elizabeth, the separation from Rome was carried to greater lengths, many doctrines being revised; but still the intention was to maintain the essentials of continuity with the pre-Reformation Church. This intention is clearly asserted in the Prayer Book (*Concerning the Service of the Church* and in the Preface to the Ordination rite): 'The service in *this Church of England* these many years hath been read in Latin . . . These inconveniences therefore considered, here is set forth such an Order, whereby the same shall be redressed'; and '. . . to the intent that these Orders [of Bishops, priests, and deacons] *may be continued*.' The intention was to maintain the ancient Church, though purified of mediaeval accretions. The Roman Catholic claim is, of course,[8] that the intention failed, and that this is proved by the fact that Roman Catholics died as martyrs for the old régime, and by the further facts as to changes in doctrine, government, and rites. The fact, however, that a conservative party believes certain changes will alter the essence of an institution, and that members of that party die for their belief, does not *prove them right* in that belief. It is quite possible for such a belief to be held mistakenly. Indeed, the progressive party *denied* that the changes effected the essence of the Church. The matter was disputed, and must be decided by examining the nature of the changes. Such examination reveals that the doctrines, practices, and rites, which were discarded, were mediaeval developments: the supreme jurisdiction of the

[7] Roundell, Earl of Selborne, *Defence of C. of E.*, p. 30.

[8] See, *e.g.* Cardinal Bourne's 1928 Lenten Pastoral (*The Tablet*, February 25th, 1928).

Roman Bishop (a jurisdiction which did not exist at the Council of Nicaea[9]): the scholastic theory of the Sacrifice of the Mass: and so on. It is *at least disputable* that these matters are essentials of Christianity: but, if they are not, then changes with regard to them will not destroy the continuity of a Church.

The Anglican Church, then, must be regarded in a light different from that in which we look at other Reformed Churches (with the probable exception of the Swedish). It is committed to the Reformation: but also it is an ancient, episcopal, Catholic Church. The Anglican Church is Reformed; but also it is Catholic: in the historic sense of that term. Thus, it stands by Catholic tradition: but that tradition must be understood in relation to the Reformation. So far as the extreme Protestant party neglects the Church's continuity, it exaggerates. So far as the extreme Catholic party neglects the Reformation, that party also exaggerates. Each factor should be the complement of the other.

The Catholic character of the Anglican Church would cause it to aim at reunion with the East and with Rome. Its Reformed character would cause it to aim at reunion with the Nonconformists. Thus it may be truly described as 'a bridge Church.'

The Malines conversations—and also, more especially, the Lausanne Conference—have had a remarkable sequel in the issue of the Papal encyclical-letter on Christian unity. Not, of course, that it would be wise to attribute the issue of that document entirely to the Lausanne and Malines events. Papal utterances are generally based on far-reaching principles, not merely on special events. However, it is not to be supposed that Lausanne and Malines had no contributing influence in leading to the publication of the encyclical *Mortalium Animos Nunquam*. In considering that document, the student will first ask: How do its statements compare with the facts of history? The encyclical is a pronouncement as to the right means of 'fostering true unity of religion.' Are its statements in agreement with the facts revealed to us by the records of history?

Christian unity, declares the Pope, already exists: in the Roman Catholic Church. All one has to do is to 'draw nigh to

[9] See Dom J. Chapman, O.S.B., *The 1st 8 Councils and Papal Infallibility*, pp. 10-11.

the Apostolic See . . . and submit to its teaching and government.' As for the efforts of those (the Pope calls them 'Panchristians') who aim at some other form of reunion, they use 'enticing words and blandishments hiding a very grave error, destructive of the foundations of Catholic faith.'

Reading, with every desire to be candid and open-minded, this encyclical, the writer of the present article has been forced to conclude that its description of the Roman Catholic Church is not a picture of the reality as found in history and actuality, but is an idealized conception of a Church which, as so described, has never existed. To say this may seem rash. However, examination will confirm the impression.

It would be, says the encyclical, 'blasphemy' (*quod sane affirmare, blasphemum est*) to say that Catholic doctrine 'has sometimes been obscured in the Church,' has become 'obscure or uncertain,' or that 'the deposit of truth . . . must be sought with laborious trouble,' or that 'men who follow contrary opinions' can belong to the Church, or that the Church's government 'has been brought in little by little according to conditions of the time.' On the contrary, Catholic doctrine 'is contained in unchangeable Revelation' (*immutabili revelatione contineatur*); it is not permissible to call some doctrines 'fundamental' and others not: for all truths are equally certain: 'Has not God revealed them all?' The One True Church 'remains visible, and exactly the same' as when first set up.

Is it not plain from history, however, that doctrines, which in the Roman Church are now held as binding articles of Revelation, have been in the past 'obscured' and 'uncertain' in the Church (in the very same *Roman* Church); that 'laborious trouble' has been needed before they have become defined as parts of 'the deposit of truth'; that, as to some doctrines which now are held to be parts of that 'unchangeable Revelation,' men have 'held contrary opinions' and yet belonged to the Church; and that the present Papal system has grown up 'little by little, according to conditions'? Is it not also a fact that doctrines, now held in the Roman Church to be 'fundamental,' have not always been so held? Would Papal infallibility 'even apart from the consent of the Church' (*non autem ex consensu ecclesiae*, as the Vatican Council of 1870 worded it) have been

acknowledged as a fundamental truth by the Nicene Council? On the contrary, that Council would not have acknowledged it as a truth at all!

Mentioning special dogmas by way of illustration, the encyclical says that the Infallibility of the Pope, 'as defined by the Vatican Council,' and the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin, must be believed 'with like faith as the mystery of the August Trinity.' Yet it is a plain fact of history that, more than a thousand years after Christ, the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception was so 'obscure and uncertain' that even the Angelic Teacher, St. Thomas of Aquin, summed up against it, and Duns Scotus, though in its favour, 'gave his opinion with a timidity which clearly betrays his consciousness that the general opinion was on the other side.'[10]

As to the Papal Infallibility, few doctrines have been so 'obscure and uncertain.' The Council of Constance (1415) decreed that the Pope is subordinate to the Council 'even in matters pertaining to faith.' True, that decree is often held to have been *ultra vires*. If it were so, however, the subject becomes not less, but more 'obscure': for the decree was the basis on which the Papacy was reconstituted, and the whole line of Popes, from Martin V to Pius XI now reigning, dates from it. Yet, in 1870, the Vatican Council declared Papal infallibility to be independent of the consent of the Church: the Pope is *not* subordinate to a Council in matters pertaining to faith! We perceive a dilemma: if the decree of 1415 was *ultra vires*, the basis on which the Papacy was reconstituted is dubious, and the validity of the succession from then till now is affected; but, if the decree was not *ultra vires*, then the Church contradicted itself in the 1415 and 1870 decrees. In any case, the whole subject is 'obscure and uncertain.'

True, the encyclical has a paragraph on what is called (it does not use the actual phrase) 'development of doctrine': the process by which doctrines have been defined from time to time 'to oppose the errors or the attacks of heretics, or more clearly and in greater detail to stamp the minds of the faithful with the articles of sacred teaching.' Does such a formula, however, at all clear up the problem? It is said 'all truths are equally

[10] Addis and Arnold, *Catholic Dictionary*, p. 441.

certain,' and have never been 'obscure.' The fact of 'development' is merely that some have been obscure and, not being 'equally clear' as others are, have had to be made clear 'according to the conditions of the time.' Far from explaining the problem, development is a contradiction of the encyclical's description of the unchangeable nature of doctrine. It is a proof that 'Catholic doctrine' has sometimes been 'obscured in the Church,' and has had 'to be sought with laborious trouble.'

A study of the encyclical *Mortalium*, then, leads to the conclusion that the Papal theory of the Church is not a correct theory. The writer of the present article once believed in it, but closer investigation altered his view; and the encyclical *Mortalium* is not a document to restore the former affirmative opinion. Its description of the Church is against historic fact, and its logic is self-contradictory: for the sections on 'immutable Revelation' are inconsistent with those on 'development.' The Papal development, moreover, has led to a mingling of temporal and spiritual claims which absolutely *had to be broken with* by the Nordic races of Europe if civilization was to develope. Would it not be an incredible paradox were the sole organ of Divine truth to involve hindrance to healthy growth?

What is the conclusion of the whole problem as to Christian unity? The Papal conception, of mere submission of others to Rome, rests on an erroneous theory of the Church. Therefore it is not the right solution. Certainly, however, it would be wrong to look for a similar form of rigid unity apart from the Papacy. Rigid unity is a *Papal* conception. If the Papal conception is wrong, why entertain ideas of reunion modelled thereon? Why entertain (as some do) a vision of some future union under a 'reformed Papacy'? Is it not far more reasonable to suppose that, as Christians *never have* formed one such united whole (*'totus, teres, atque rotundus'*), so perhaps such unity is not of the real spirit of Christianity, but is a faulty, one-sided development thereof? It is notorious that the development of such unity under the Papacy was largely an inheritance not from the teaching of Jesus, but from the Old Imperial Caesarism of Rome. It was one road taken by the spiritual teaching of Christianity when mingled with the rough clay of earth. Eastern Orthodoxy was another. The Protestant

Reformation produced others. There is *no* one single true development. Christianity is not a rigid code of dogmas, but a spiritual leaven in the world. The Papal conception is too narrow, and therefore, far from it being a duty to repudiate the Reformation and return to the Papacy, it is a duty to maintain the freedom of thought which the Reformation initiated in Western Europe (with lasting influence on the whole world). That freedom will lead to greater simplification, not to any rigid reunion. Such rigid reunion will never come. Why dream of it? Christians should aim at greater mutual love and co-operation, not at uniformity of organization and dogma.

J. W. Poynter.

JULIAN OF NORWICH

IN the parish of Conisford, near Norwich, stands a little church dedicated to St. Julian, and about its foundations may be seen traces of an 'anchorage' built against its south-eastern wall. This anchorage—probably a little hut of only two rooms—was occupied during the latter part of the fourteenth century and well on into the fifteenth by an 'ankeress,' possibly one of the nuns of Carrow, a Benedictine house to which the church of St. Julian had been assigned by King Stephen. This 'hermitess,' known to us as the Lady Julian, left behind her writings which have come as an unexpected revelation to us to-day.

We in the twentieth century look with a half-contemptuous tolerance upon the hermits of the ascetic age and are quick to dismiss any spiritual experience involving 'objective vision' as 'pathological.' To those so inclined a perusal of the writings of the Lady Julian may tend to a revision of this attitude.

No doubt any element of objective vision must be regarded with caution. But the appeal of these writings resides not in the visions they record, but in their ethical, spiritual, and even literary content which leaves the deepest impression on the mind of the reader. It is this side only which is touched on very briefly in this article.

To those who study the Lady Julian's writings, the phrase 'the Beauty of Holiness' must surely come to have a clearer significance. Her voice speaks to the reader with such infinite loveliness that as he reads he is conscious of a feeling that is almost bewilderment. The beauty of all that is fair and sweet and fragrant seems to live in her words—beauty as of the song of birds on a Spring evening—blackthorn in flower against a sky of vivid blue—the tender gold and red of an English sunset and other statelier loveliness—majestic growth of ancient trees —snow-clad peaks fading into the distance—the grace and dignity of some noble cathedral. In her imagery and symbolism we catch glimpses of all that is fairest in human relationships—mother-love in its infinite power of self-sacrifice—child-love and trust—the utmost devotion of loyal service, as of a servant to a greatly-loved master—knightly chivalry at its best and highest —and, over all, an infinite compassion and tenderness that cannot endure to blame, and a passionate goodness that cannot brook the least touch of evil in the object of its love.

As we read her account, written late in life, of the 'shewings' that were made to her in youth, we see that she shared in the pain and struggle that in all ages falls to the lot of the religious thinker—the conflict between the traditional teaching of the Church and the insight of a powerful intellect and an intensely loving heart. 'All shall be well,' she cries, in triumphant faith, and then, with unutterable pathos, come these words, 'One point of our faith is that many creatures shall be condemned . . . to hell without end as Holy Church teacheth me to believe. And . . . so . . . methought it was impossible that all manner of things should be well as our Lord shewed in the same time.' In her dilemna she receives a repeated assurance that 'all shall be well,' and there she wisely leaves the matter.

She is at first puzzled as to how the righteousness of God may be reconciled with His love—'I understood sinners are worthy sometime of blame and wrath, but these two I could not see in God.' Her solution of the problem is a familiar one, a 'platitude,' and it has the unchangeable truth of a platitude tested and proven by generations of storm-tossed souls—'We shall see . . . that we have grieviously sinned in this life, and

notwithstanding this . . . that we were never hurt in His love. we were never of less price in His sight.' 'Strong and marvellous is that love which may not, nor will not be broken for trespass.' 'He willeth . . . that we endlessly hate the sin and endlessly love the soul as God loveth it.'

The breadth and clearness of her intellectual outlook is very remarkable since she describes herself as 'A simple creature that could no letter.' Her doctrines of the 'Nature-substance' and the 'sense-soul' and a 'godly will (in man) that never assented to sin and never shall,' recall certain tendencies of thought that have appeared under various guises in both ancient and modern philosophy. A striking point in her teaching is her refusal to admit of any opposition between 'nature' and 'grace.' Take the following passage: 'Here we may see that we have verily of Nature to hate sin, and we have verily of Grace to hate sin. For Nature is all good and fair in itself and Grace was sent out to save Nature and destroy sin and bring again fair Nature to the blessed point from whence it came; that is God; with more nobleness and worship by the virtuous working of Grace. For it shall be seen afore God by all His holy ones in joy without end, that Nature hath been essayed in the fire of tribulation and therein hath been found no flaw.'

This is, to say the least, remarkable teaching from the pen of a mediaeval recluse.

If ever a thinker deserved the ugly name of optimist, Julian deserves it. For her the deeper the shadow the brighter the light—'Grace worketh our dreadful failing into plenteous, endless solace; and Grace worketh our shameful falling into high, worshipful rising; and Grace worketh our sorrowful dying into holy, blissful life.'

For her, as for St. Paul and St. John, love is the *summum bonum*, the meaning and fulfilment of all the revelations that have been made to her. 'I was learned,' she says, 'that love was our Lord's meaning . . . and I saw full surely that before God made us He loved us; which love was never slackened nor ever shall be . . . And all this we shall see in God, without end.'

IRENE HUBBARD.

MEDIÆVAL WILLS AND CHANTRIES

THE monasteries, established continuously in England from early Saxon times till the close of the thirteenth century, were designed by the founders for the glory of God and for the health of their own souls and those of their parents and relations. The *post mortem* benefit was provided by Masses offered by men leading a strictly religious life, who were neither in the world, nor of it. It was thus that our ancestors stretched forth lame hands into the future and endeavoured to provide for it. The monasteries, however, were tried and found wanting. Revelations were constantly being made that the lives of many of the monks were not what they should have been. There was, moreover, a growing feeling against the alienation of so much land to men who bore so small a share of their country's burdens. For these reasons, monasteries were no longer founded, and, until the Reformation, permanent endowments took the form of establishing chantries. Benefactions and offerings, however, continued to be made to already existing convents.

Certain, however, it is that the same anxiety was still felt by most people for the future of their souls; they dared not depart 'unhouseled, disappointed, unanealed.' They could not 'leave the warm precincts of the cheerful day' and embark, without forethought, on their voyage to a land of which they had heard much that was uninviting. Such for ages was the outlook of the mediaeval mind. That the Church had gradually secured the probate of all wills, that the men who drew them, whether notaries or not, were almost always ecclesiastics, that some of the witnesses and executors were parish priests, abbots, priors, or friars, all these facts had a direct tendency to encourage the feeling already so strongly working in a testator's mind. It was for these spiritual persons to indicate channels into which his generosity might flow, and to point out that neither would 'his bed comfort him nor his couch ease his complaint,' until he had paid his passage to the next world by providing for the needs of the Church in this, thus showing his sense of the value of the

services which she alone could render. The result was found in bequests to neighbouring priors, vicars and friars for their prayers, in fees to 'priests and clerks present at the *placebo*,[1] *dirige*,[2] Masses and burying,' in money for tapers to 'brenne'[3] before the images of saints, or towards the maintenance of the four lights of the Church, or to enrich its altar, or for its bells, or perhaps for a daily Mass to be celebrated by some 'sad and honest priest.' A favourite form of this last bequest was to provide a Trental, or daily Mass, for a period of thirty days. Gifts were often made in kind. Thus a testator, in 1487, left to each of two of the lights in his parish church 'one cow with calf.' Another bequeathed to the light of one church three cows; for the use of another he left a reliquary.[4] Wax, a very costly necessary in the churches, was always a welcome legacy, and the bee-masters of those days must have been at least as successful as those of our own. There is a case in which a testator bequeathed sixty pounds of wax to one church, ten to another, and five to three others. A priest might find himself possessed of a late parishioner's 'best blue furred gowne,' or 'his best skarlet gowne' for forgotten tithes, or 'a gowne of crymsyn velvett to make a peyre of vestments for the high altar,' or a 'long gowne of violett colour.' The Church of St. Mary Magdalene, Taunton, found itself the richer, under the will of Dame Agnes Burton, by 'a sute of black vestiments with cope and corporas,[5] a chalys, a peyre of cruetts of silver for high daies, a peire of cruetts of tinne, a bell of silver, another of laten,[6] four peir of vestiments with four corporas, four awlter clothes, 4 towellys, a strong coffre to put all theis ornaments yn, a censor of silver, a paxbrede,[7] and all my hole clothe of thissewe, the sensor to be occupied at the high awter in high fests.' Ladies might turn their dresses to good account. Thus we find the above-named

[1] Name given to Vespers in the Office for the Dead, so called from the opening word of the Antiphon.

[2] Antiphon beginning with this word sung at Matins in the Office for the Dead.

[3] Brenne = burn.

[4] A small casket for holding relics.

[5] A Eucharistic vestment.

[6] A mixed metal of yellow colour similar to brass.

[7] A tablet bearing the Crucifixion or other sacred object kissed by the Priest at Mass; sometimes called osculatory.

Agnes Burton leaving to the service of the Gild of the Sepulchre in St. Mary's Church, Taunton, 'her red damask mantell and mantell lyned with sylke, to the intent of a "Mary Magdaleyn" play, a rochet[8] and a box of silver and gilt.' Those who peruse such a list of bequests by a single individual to a provincial parish church may form some idea of the extent of the loot of such objects which accompanied the Reformation. The generosity of Agnes Burton was by no means exhausted with her distribution of those concrete gifts already described. She provided a Chantry in St. Mary's Church in which Masses should be said daily by an honest 'prieste' for her own soul, and those of her late husband and his former wife. 'Every Wednysday in the yiere the priest should say the masse of the "Fyve woundes," and at the "Month's Mind,"[9] dirige and commendation[10] with the Psalms of the Passion.' The Chantry Priest appointed to the office received the liberal income of nine marks a year.[11] Dame Agnes left twenty shillings[12] to the Prior of Taunton and the same sum to the Vicar of St. Mary's to pray for her, and to every priest present at her 'dirige and Mass' one shilling.[13] An income was provided for annual presents of 'gowns and smocks' to the poor. She gave gowns of frieze and torches to six poor men attending her funeral, who were also each to have 4d.[14] in money.

A distribution of loaves of the value of one farthing[15] to the poor at a funeral is often mentioned. Some legacy to the fabric fund of the Cathedral, varying in amount with the means of the testator, almost always found a place in wills.

It may be mentioned that there was at Wells a brotherhood of St. Andrew's, which devoted itself to the work of collecting

[8] A close-fitting linen vestment.

[9] A religious celebration held after the expiration of a month from the date of a funeral.

[10] An office in which the souls of the dead were commended to God.

[11] Modern Value £180. Present day values are perhaps forty times as much as those of the first half of the fifteenth century, thirty times as much as those of the latter half of that century and the first half of the sixteenth century. The modern values are noted at the foot of the pages where sums of money occur.

[12] M. £30.

[13] M. £1 10*s*.

[14] M. 10*s*.

[15] M. 7½*d*.

money for the Cathedral in many other ways. A large number of Masses was usually arranged for by wealthy testators. Thus a Somerset squire ordered three thousand Masses to be sung for his soul, 'with everyone of them a bill for the soul of me and my friends.' This bill was a list of those prayed for, and was recited by the bidder or bedesman present at the service. For each of the Masses the sum of four pence[16] was to be paid to the Priest.

Lady St. Maur, who died in 1409, provided five hundred pounds, on condition that four thousand Masses should be sung 'for the faithful departed' by 'discreet and suitable priests' within a month of her decease. A 'Gregory trental,' which consisted of thirty Masses, three to be said on each of ten great festivals during the year following her death, was also commanded, and the celebrating chaplain was to be well remunerated. The sum of five pounds[17] was also divided between forty priests, and three pounds[18] left for distribution among the testator's poorer tenantry. A startling bequest was made in 1421 by Walter Medeford, a munificent and benevolent Dean of Wells, who divided the sum of £2 6s. 8d.[19] among seven innocent women.' They were to say 'plenum psalterium,' the entire psalter, in remission of the seven deadly sins by which the testator had 'so often offended God.' Doubtless with a thought in his mind of the parable of the ten virgins, the Dean also ordered that ten virgins should be chosen to say the full psalter and a devotion to the Blessed Virgin, in satisfaction of his breaches of the ten commandments. Five chaplains were appointed to sing a Trental of St. Gregory for the sins wherein he had 'offended God' in his five senses. Medeford also left gifts 'to the Master of the Scholars' at Wells, and a handsome gratuity to the boys, on condition that for a month after his death, they should devoutly stand, before leaving the school and going to supper, and say for his soul and the souls of the faithful dead, the psalm *De profundis* with the customary prayers. Many most benevolent legacies followed these bequests, which included money to be devoted to the liberation of prisoners pining in the great London prisons of Ludgate and Newgate.

Sir Humphrey Stafford, whose will was proved at Lambeth in 1469, implored his executors to be faithful to their trust 'and

[16] M. 10*s*. [17] M. £200. [18] M. £120. [19] M. £93 6*s*. 8*d*.

not to forget him the poor pilgrim as they should answer "afore the high Juge," so that he might have no cause to cry upon them at the dreadful day of doom.' Sir Humphrey left numerous pious and charitable bequests, the most astonishing of which is his commission to the Gray Friars of Exeter to visit every parish in Dorset, Somerset, Wiltshire, Devonshire and Cornwall, and preach a sermon in each of the churches in these counties.

Sir R. Hungerford left a vast amount of property to religious uses, and gave to each of 'one thousand priests saying the exequies of the dead, commendations of seven penitential psalms,' the sum of one shilling.[20]

We have seen that Agnes Burton founded a perpetual chantry in St. Mary's Church, Taunton. Besides perpetual chantries, there were those founded only for a period of years or an even shorter time. Others involved the celebration of Masses once a year on the occasion of an obit or anniversary of death; the priest responsible for this duty was called an 'annueller.' Sometimes more than one 'obit' in the year was provided for; the word 'obit' being then equivalent to 'special celebration.' In any case, the chantry implied a special endowment assuring the services of a priest to sing Masses for the souls of the departed. The chantry might be established at an existing altar in a cathedral, in a parish or monastic church, or in a new chapel attached to an ecclesiastical edifice already existing, or, as was more rarely the case, in a detached building erected in the churchyard or elsewhere. The priests whose services were enlisted were often the cathedral, monastic, or parochial clergy: but a class of cantarists or chantry-priests arose who devoted themselves specially to this kind of duty, often uniting different chantries. The priests of the perpetual chantries, however, if their chantries were in towns, were generally obliged to act as curates to the vicars in whose parishes the chantries existed.

We may perhaps form some idea of the vastness of the chantry system if we consider the number of altars, often amounting to thirty or more, which existed in our cathedrals before the Reformation. At each of these altars Masses were being sung without intermission during the morning, for the repose of the souls of the founders of chantries and their friends. A cathedral must have been the framework of a scene of which

[20] M. £1 10s.

but a faint picture can now be traced by the imagination. The high altar beautifully draped, blazing with lights, its chanting priests adorned with the richest vestments; the lesser altars, each with a priest and assistants pleading in low tones for the souls of the departed, must indeed have created an atmosphere of awe and mystery. So numerous were the chantry services in the cathedrals, that the names of priests responsible for them were placed weekly on notice-boards, for their guidance.

Nicholas Bubwith, Bishop of Bath and Wells from 1408 to 1424, and once Treasurer of England, supplies us with an instance of chantries founded by a wealthy and munificent prelate. He established one of the chantries founded by him in a chapel, which he says 'I caused to be made for the chantries of certain chaplains to celebrate divine offices for my soul and the souls of my parents and benefactors.' In a second chantry, which he founded in conjunction with others within the monastic church of Mucheley Abbey, a daily Mass and a weekly Mass of requiem were ordered at the altar of All Saints, 'with a ringing at each Mass with three peals of a certain bell in the belfry.'

The bishop also gave houses of the annual value of seven pounds, one shilling and four pence,[21] as well as vestments and other gifts, reputed to be worth two hundred pounds,[22] to the Abbey of Bath, on condition that two monks should daily celebrate Masses for his soul. The celebrant, after putting on his alb before the Confession, was to say: 'For Bishop Nychols saule, and for his fader et moder saulis and al his goode doerys sawlys and al the good doerys sawlys of this churche.' Each of the celebrating monks was paid 10½d. weekly, but the monks as a body were liable for bread, wine, lights, vestments and the ornaments of the chapel. A donation was divided between the monks present at the service held on the anniversary of the Bishop's death. The vestments given by Bubwith included 'a casuble[23] and two tunicles[24] with their furniture of crymesyn velvet with orfreys[25] powdered with pearls, three copes of cloth of gold of one suit, two with orfreys woven with the twelve apostles and clasps set with pearls rose-fashion, the third with an orfrey with figures in two rows.'

[21] M. £212. [22] M. £6,000.

[23] A sleeveless vestment worn over the alb by the Priest when celebrating Mass. [24] Short vestment of a deacon worn at Mass.

[25] A gold-thread ornament of a vestment: often a border or band.

The will of Bishop Erghum, one of Bubwith's immediate predecessors, provided for the founding of a chantry in the chapel of St. Edmund, once King of East Anglia. The endowment required a daily Mass for King Richard II, the Bishop, his father, mother, and sister. The full office of the dead was to be sung in the choir on St. Nicholas' Day during the life of the Bishop and afterwards on the anniversary of his death, 'with solemn sounding of the gongs.'

The religious Gilds, to which in the Middle Ages so many belonged, were at once pious and religious, and had often a very large membership. The Gild of Corpus Christi in York, for example, had no less than fifteen thousand brethren and sisters. The Gilds helped the poor, the sick, the infirm, the aged and those going on pilgrimages. They often founded almshouses and schools, repaired roads, walls and bridges, and, in a word, performed many a work of mercy and social service. On the day of their great annual meeting, the members feasted together for the 'nourishing of brotherly love.' Afterwards, in solemn wise 'the brethren and sustren' went to church in their hoods and liveries, and bearing lights, in a great procession. Then, at a solemn service, those of the Society who had passed away were prayed for. Gilds often established chantries in the churches for this purpose, and as money was forthcoming from endowments, legacies and subscriptions, they could maintain their chantry priests with credit.

There were two such Gild chantries, for example, in St. Mary's Church, Taunton, those of the High Cross and the Sepulchre. A testator resident in the town rarely forgot to give the equivalent of at least ten pounds to the High Cross service, and the like sum to the Sepulchre service, often with the request to be prayed for 'as a broder.' These two Gilds possessed messuages, burgages and market-stalls. The High Cross Gild made an annual distribution of money to the poor, while the Sepulchre Gild divided an annual sum between inmates of almshouses and the poor. The 'brethren and sustren' of such social or religious gilds behaved to one another in life with real sense and fellowship. They went as mourners to the funerals of those who had passed away, and tried to benefit their souls by services and prayers after they had departed. They believed that in this way

they could help the poor struggling souls of their beloved as they passed through their weary pilgrimage of penance:

> 'Donec longa dies perfecto temporis orbe
> Concretam exemit labem, purumque reliquit
> Aethereum sensum, atque aurai simplicis ignem.' [26]

Gilds, universal in towns, were to be found even in villages. Such fraternities existed in the Somerset villages of North Curry, Ashbrittle, Nettlecombe, and Middlezoy. Of the chantry maintained by the brotherhood in the last-named village, it is stated in the Valuation of 1545, 'there be neither lands, tenements, nor hereditaments belonging to the said fraternity which was always maintained by the devotion of the people.' It says much for the benevolence of the Gild members in this little village that they could carry on the work of their Gild and maintain their chantry, with no other resources than the subscriptions of the members.

The chantry 'in the ile of St. Thomas of Caunterbury' in the Church of St. Mary, West Harptree, is a good example of a chantry within a parish church, founded by a private individual for the health of the souls of himself and his personal friends. This chantry, endowed in 1511 by John Poole, yeoman, 'being quick of mind,' provided for his burial in the aisle of his chantry, and for the services of an 'honest priest' to sing there, at a salary of six pounds, thirteen shillings and fourpence[27] a year, a Mass for the souls of the donor, his ancestors, kinsmen and children, and, in addition, to celebrate a solemn Mass on each of four obits, or special commemorations of his death. These Masses were respectively in honour of 'the Blissid Trinitie, the five woundes of Jesus Christ, the five joyes of our Blissid Lady, and Saint Savior.' The cantarist was to be furnished with 'an honest house with a gardyn grounde.' The testator did not forget to enlist the suffrages of several houses of Friars, giving the Franciscans of Bridgwater as much as fifty pounds. The Vicar of West Harptree received a legacy of a hundred sheep, the Church of West Harptree the same number, 'to be let for its

[26] Till a long course of time, when the cycle is complete, has purged away the long-contracted stain and left pure the ethereal essence and unadulterated fire of heaven (Virg. Æ. vi, 745-748. Trans. by Lonsdale and Lee).

[27] M. £200.

advantage.' Richard Bere, Abbot of Glastonbury, was appointed as executor of the will, with a legacy of ten pounds.[28] On the Abbot fell the duty of providing four hundred additional Masses for the health of the testator's soul. There can be little doubt that these were celebrated in the Abbey of Glastonbury itself.

An example of a chantry in an external chapel specially constructed for the purpose may be found at Idstock, in the parish of Chilton, near Bridgwater, and established, in 1416, by Sir William Paulet in his life-time. The foundation contained many provisions usual at the period. It is remarkable, however, for the expressed determination of Sir William, that his chantry-priest should never belong to the hunting, poaching, roving and negligent fraternity then so common and often so severely censured by the bishops. He was bidden, at the risk of losing his chantry, 'to abstain from any cure, ministrations, secular offices, huntings and public business which might give occasion for wanderings and absence.'

The more valuable chantries, especially those in the cathedrals, were so attractive that some vicars farmed their benefices to chaplains and spent their lives in performance of these light and well-paid duties. Chaucer tells us that his 'poor parson of a town' rose superior to such a temptation as this:

> 'He sette nat his benefice to hyre
> And leet his sheep encombred in the myre,
> And ran to London, unto Seint Poules
> To seeken hym a chaunterie for soules.'

The disinclination to take up parochial work and to find instead such chantries as involved nothing of the kind, was the subject of universal complaint. When, after the Black Death, there was a great shortage of clergy, this evil was aggravated. Archbishop Islip voiced the sentiments of his colleagues when he declared that vicars for parishes could not be found, because chantries were considered by selfish priests to be an easier and better-paid form of clerical work. Ignoring the fact that by ordering priests to be content with the salaries current before the Plague, he was trying to make them work in parishes for a starvation wage, Islip spoke scathingly of those who 'betook themselves to the celebration of annals for the quick and dead,

[28] M. £300.

and pampered with excessive salaries, discharged their intemperance in vomit and lust, and drowned themselves in the abyss of vice.'

Whatever truth may lurk in the Archbishop's dismal words, they are applicable mainly to the 'annuellers' or other chantry-priests celebrating only at intervals. The priests of the perpetual chantries, as already stated, were expected, and often bound, by the founders to assist the vicars of the churches within which their chantries were celebrated, at the usual services, and were, in fact, their curates. Chantry-chapels, moreover, were often built in outlying hamlets distant from the parish church, and in these the usual services were taken by the cantarist, in addition to his chantry duties. There must have been a great fall in the standard of worship, both in town churches and many country parishes, when the chantries were swept away.

A minor form of pious offering is found in bequests towards the maintenance of the four lights of the Church, or to a light burning before the image of one of the saints. The four lights of the Church were the light before the altar of the Blessed Virgin, the Sepulchre light, the dead light or 'Alsolen light,' and the High Cross light. These lights were kept dimly and religiously burning partly by bequests, and partly by gifts of money or kind. Sometimes, as in the case of a light at Dunster, there was a small endowment in land.

The mutterings of the storm in which the chantries were to perish were heard in 1529, when an Act was passed forbidding the foundation of new ones. This was followed, in 1535, by a valuation of all ecclesiastical property known as *Valor ecclesiasticus*. This valuation was required by the transfer of certain dues from the Pope to the Crown under the Annates Act which followed the Act of Supremacy of 1534.

In 1545, the Chantries' Act was passed, transferring the property of the chantries to the services of the Exchequer and to 'such good and godly uses' as the services of education and provision for the poor. Henry VIII, however, died before it was possible adequately to translate into fact the purpose of appropriating these lands. The statesmen of the young King Edward accordingly secured the passing of an Act which confiscated to the Crown the entire chantry funds, including the amount realized by the sale of plate, vestments, and ornaments,

all the lands belonging to the Gilds, and even the petty endowments which helped to maintain the lights in the churches. Great exception was taken in the Commons to the wrongful appropriation of the Gild property, which crippled the usefulness of the most beneficent agencies in the country. The opposition, however, was overborne and the measure was carried in its entirety.

Thus, then, in 1547, the chantries passed away. Promises of using their endowments for the relief of the poor, the increasing of the income of small livings, the paying the salaries of preachers and the founding of free schools, were to some extent fulfilled, as Strype tells us, by the establishment of numerous grammar schools. Some of these schools were new foundations, others had been previously maintained from the funds of the Gild Fraternities.

Much of the property, however, was pledged to the relief of the empty Exchequer and could not be devoted to social services. Moreover the Government, as is usual in the case of forced sales, failed to secure adequate value. Trafficking in abbey lands became a lucrative business with those who had become 'gospellers' for profit. Of such gospellers Bishop Latimer, Reformer though he was, said in a sermon preached before Edward VI, less than three years after the abolition of the chantries, that 'they were carnal gospellers, as many be nowadays for a piece of an abbey and a portion of chantry lands.'

H. P. Palmer.

BOOK REVIEWS

THE JEWISH ORIGINS OF THE CHRISTIAN SACRAMENTS

In spite of Bultmann's protest, the historical investigations into the origins of Christianity are still largely determined by the antithesis, Jew or Gentile. Were the determining factors in the development of Christian theology and practice to be found in the Jewish soil in which the new religion was rooted, or in the Gentile soil to which it was so soon transplanted? German scholars tend to allow the predominating place to the orientalized Hellenism of the first century; some of them, *e.g.*, Norden, Reitzenstein, carry this thesis to extreme limits. It does not follow that such Hellenisation (even if historically correct) meant a degradation of Christianity. Many sides of the mysteries, with their essentially *religious* outlook and their offer of σωτηρία, were at least as attractive and Christian as the stereotyped legalism of much of first century Judaism.

Nevertheless, it is again becoming recognized (what ought never to have been forgotten) that Christianity started its career as a Jewish sect,

and that its theology necessarily presupposed the ethics and religion of the Old Testament. It had existed for at least some years before the heritage of the Gentiles began to be incorporated. This is not least true in the sphere of sacramental doctrine; and the two books before us, Dr. Gavin's *The Jewish Antecedents of the Christian Sacraments*[1] and Professor Hans Lietzmann's *Messe und Herrenmahl*,[2] both insist upon the importance of the Jewish background for the development of sacramental practice. The main thesis of Dr. Gavin's little book (the unpretentious dimensions of which are no indication of the extent of its learning) is that 'two factors explain (Christian) Sacramentalism—Judaism and Jesus' (p. 113). The word Eucharist, which was apparently a *terminus technicus* as early as the *Didache*, and certainly in the Ignatian Epistles, is derived from the designation which the Jews gave to their blessings at meals—*Berakha*. The word had the double signification of blessing and thanksgiving; and this accounts for the application of εὐχαριστία as the title of the service. What is true of its name is also true of the service itself. Dr. Gavin sums up his study in the words:

> 'Jewish precedents, usages, and ideas determined the form (of the Christian Eucharist). Christian theology established its meaning . . . He who instituted the observance of the Breaking of the Bread gave thanks over it, and called it His Body. The Thanksgiving was potent, since He Who spake it was God Incarnate . . . The Eucharist was the Christian *Berakha*, infinitely transcending the customary blessings of Judaism, yet in its form modelled upon the Common Fellowship Meal of Jewish groups of friends' (pp. 96 *f.*).

It is recorded of an eminent scholar that when he was asked the question, 'Do you study liturgiology?' he replied, 'No! Neither do I collect postage-stamps.' He might have seen reason to have modified the implied judgment on the character of liturgical science if he had been able to see a copy of Dr. Lietzmann's *Messe und Herrenmahl*. The Berlin professor, in a first-rate piece of work, attempts to track the main forms of eucharistic rite in the early centuries back to their origin in the New Testament, and beyond. The study is carried out inductively; and the student will need considerable resources and perseverance if he is to struggle through Lietzmann's 263 pages. In addition to the extensive extracts which the author prints, the reader will need many more if he is to follow the argument carefully. The majority (though not all) of the Greek liturgies will be found in Dr. Brightman's standard treatise; but the Western liturgies are less easily accessible. Parts of the earlier sections of the study will repay careful attention; for there are fresh discussions on such hackneyed themes as the origin of the use of incense in Christian worship (86 *ff.*), the traces of the Epiclesis in the Roman Mass (117 *ff.*), the Agape in the early Church (197 *ff.*), and the liturgy of the *Didache* (230 *ff.*). But it is the last fifty pages which are the most important. Lietzmann concludes that the Eucharist originally developed from the Jewish meal known as the *Kiddush*, which was eaten on the first evening of the Sabbath. (It will be remembered that this view was also put forward by Canon G. H. Box in the *J.T.S.*, 1902.) He maintains that the Last Supper was clearly *not* the Passover meal, since (1) there is no reference to the Paschal Lamb; (2) there is no reference to the Midrash on the Exodus and the Wanderings, which was customary at the Passover; (3) unleavened *mazzoth*, not bread, was eaten at the Passover; and (4) four

[1] S.P.C.K., 1928. Price 5/-.

[2] *Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte*, Bonn, 1926. Price 12 marks.

cups had to be drunk at the Pascal meal, whereas only one cup appears at the Last Supper (p. 211).

The Christian rite, based initially on the ritual of the Kiddush, existed in the early Church in two distinct forms. The one type had its roots in the Jerusalem community, the other in St. Paul, who was 'the creator of this second type of the Lord's Supper' (p. 255). This type

> '. . . is found first in the Pauline Churches; it was developed on Hellenistic soil, and, together with Hellenised Christianity (*Heidenchristentum*), secured a complete victory, whereas the survivals of the first type (of Eucharist) are met with chiefly in the sphere of influence of Jewish Christianity. The only province of the Church in which we find appreciable traces of the first type at a relatively late date . . . is Egypt, *i.e.* the country which Paul did not visit, and in which there were in consequence no Pauline Churches' (p. 254).

Whereas the Jewish type of rite was a continuation of the regular fellowship-meal of our Lord and His disciples, the Pauline type was a direct commemoration of the Last Supper. The designation 'breaking of bread' which is found in *Acts* is an indication, among others, as Harnack noted as far back at 1891, that in the early Church the wine was not an invariable accompaniment.

Like Batiffol, Lietzmann argues against the existence of the Agape as a separate rite in early times. F.L.C.

THE TRUTH ABOUT FASTING COMMUNION.*

Dr. Percy Dearmer's timely little treatise, *The Truth about Fasting*, deserves serious attention, especially by the clergy. It has been said that 'a man who can believe that it is wrong to communicate after breakfast will believe anything.' This may be true, but there are many who half-believe a thing and suffer from many scruples in consequence. These especially should read this book. It should reduce the opposition of Anglo-Catholics to the Revised Deposited Book, where it permits individuals to decide entirely for themselves whether they will fast or not before partaking of Holy Communion.

Dr. Dearmer shows that the rule of fasting communion was of very gradual growth, and was not definitely established until 1270 A.D. under the influence of St. Thomas Aquinas. Of course our Lord's teaching gives no support at all to it—indeed, the reverse. Modern study of the Gospels brings out clearly His strong opposition to claiming moral and spiritual authority for ceremonial regulations as though they were commandments of God. St. Paul's incisive declaration, 'Neither if we eat are we the better, neither if we eat not are we the worse,' is decisive for this controversy.

On the other hand, although Dr. Dearmer shows that fasting communion is neither apostolic nor ancient, he insists, quite rightly, that we have no right to criticize those who practise it because they find it to be a spiritual help. Yet while, as Dr. Pusey wrote: 'There is no irreverence in non-fasting communion.' 'There is no binding law,' yet there is a kind of teaching widely prevalent about the practice which is doing much harm. Dr. Dearmer writes:

'A priest with many years' experience as a missioner urged me to write this book, and another diocesan missioner, whose name would command the highest respect, hearing of this investigation, has sent me the

**The Truth about Fasting.* By Professor Percy Dearmer, D.D. (Rivingtons, 34 King Street, Covent Garden, London. 1928. Price 3/6.)

following notes of his experience in the matter: "My work," he says, "has brought home to me in a startling way the real dangers into which we are rapidly drifting. The practical results are manifesting themselves in deplorable ways. (1) There are thousands of all ages who for physiological reasons are unable to go fasting. (2) There are thousands, engaged in agriculture, or toiling in small houses with no servants and a number of little children to look after, who are debarred from getting to church till mid-day or until the evening. (3) There are devoted priests who have so sapped their mental energy by the strain of keeping a fast till mid-day that (*a*) they are quite incapable of preaching a proper sermon, and degenerate into a string of childish platitudes; (*b*) they stop in bed till the mid-day service, throwing an unnecessary burden on their colleagues for the earlier services and the Sunday Schools. (4) There are numbers of people who have cut themselves off from the greatest means of grace for fear of 'sin.' I am aware that the psychological inhibitions of the clerical unconscious are formidable beyond expression. It may be too late: the herd-instinct and tradition are so strong. But for the sake of truth I wish you my blessing, to stem the tide before the ship goes on the rocks. I am appalled at what I have seen and known, and saddened beyond words to express."' (p. 11.)

The author closes his argument with Tertullian's fine utterance: *Christus veritatem se, non consuetudinem cognominavit* (*De Virginibus Velandis*, I)—'Christ named Himself not Custom but the Truth.'

H.D.A.M.

A TRUMPET CALL.*

The Lambeth Encyclical contained the following noble sentence:

> 'The vision which rises before us is that of a Church genuinely Catholic, loyal to all Truth, and gathering in its fellowship all who profess and call themselves Christians, within whose visible unity all the treasures of faith and order, bequeathed as a heritage by the past to the present, shall be possessed in common and made serviceable to the whole body of Christ.'

Inspired by this utterance, the Rev. Francis Ridley, Chairman of the Congregational Union of England and Wales, delivered on May 8th, 1928, an address on 'A Church Genuinely Catholic.' In it he seeks to describe for practical purposes the essential and distinctive marks of Catholicity. These are four:

(1) A Church, genuinely Catholic, is willing to include within its fellowship everyone who cherishes the faith and spirit of Jesus. This is its *Catholic Basis.*

(2) A Church, genuinely Catholic, welcomes Truth from every quarter and has its eyes always open to the light. This is the second note of universality—the *Catholic Outlook.*

(3) A Church, genuinely Catholic, proclaims a religion that covers the whole of life, bringing every province under the sovereignty of Christ. This is the *Catholic Message.*

(4) A Church, genuinely Catholic, regards the whole world as its parish, the world outside its own doors and the world beyond the seas. This is its *Catholic Mission.*

We congratulate the writer on his selection of the marks of Catholicity. Any Church which is less Catholic than this cannot rightly claim the title.

H.D.A.M.

**A Church genuinely Catholic.* By Rev. Francis Ridley. (Congregational Union, Farringdon Street, E.C.4. 1928. Price 3d.)

DR. BARTH AND DR. SCHWEITZER.*

Mr. Martin Werner's *Das Weltanschauungsproblem bei Karl Barth und Albert Schweitzer* is a book that no Englishman would write, and that few Englishmen, whether philosophers or theologians, would read; but it serves very well as a means of comparing the old way and the new way of facing the great problem of the universe and ourselves in it.

'Darwin's triumph has destroyed the whole theological scheme,' said the Bishop of Birmingham last September, and the fact that such a sweeping statement can be made so publicly shows how urgent the need is for fresh thought on fundamental problems. The most fundamental one of all is that of settling for ourselves the meaning of the universe and our position in it. 'The world, as it is, in which we have to will and to act, invites us to reflect on the question how it is and what it is, which means, however, how we live in it, and what we ought to do in it,' says Dr. Barth, and Dr. Schweitzer says exactly the same thing in other language (I, p. 80).

The Christian answer to the problem is based on *Genesis*, which declares that the world, as it left its Creator's hands, was very good, and that it is so still, its evil being the work of a hostile, though inferior, power. The Christian outlook is, therefore, on the whole optimistic, and all Western thought has followed this lead, resting on an optimistic-ethical interpretation of the world by which 'a meaning is attributed to the world which permits us to explain the goal of man and humanity as something rational and significant' (II, p. ix). If this basis of thought is rejected, as it is by Dr. Schweitzer, how are we to find a fresh solution of our fundamental problem?

Dr. Barth makes the great problem of our thought to consist in defining the relation between an absolutely transcendent God and ourselves, and jumps back over the centures to the *Epistle to the Romans,* on which he writes a commentary of 523 pages! He recognizes that the world is evil, almost without qualification; so evil, indeed, that God must be absolutely transcendent, and, because absolutely transcendent, therefore absolutely unknown—in spite of *Rom.* i, 19*f.*! Man is also evil, and there is a gulf between him and God. But 'originally there was no such gulf. Originally man lived in Paradise, where there is no higher and lower; where the Cosmos is one with [God's] Creation, and man is one with God; where all that is natural is, as such, also holy.' So there must have been a Fall, though it is not to be conceived as being in any sense an 'historical-psychical event'; the entrance of sin into the world is rather 'a timeless-transcendental disposition of mankind' and a 'rupture of the spiritual bond which holds together God, the world, and mankind, a Creator and his Creation.' Hence came death, and if there be any salvation, it must be from death, which is the sum of all evil and the riddle of our life. And as salvation 'can come only from God, who is not to be found in the world, salvation is a pure miracle, an absolute vertical miracle, direct from above.' Barth's ethical system assumes man's absolute degradation.

Obviously Dr. Barth's answer to the common question affords no help towards reconciling theology with either philosophy or science!

How does Dr. Schweitzer start?

Cardinal Newman has left it on record that the belief that he was elected to eternal glory 'confirmed me in my mistrust of the reality of material phenomena, and made me rest in the thought of two and only two

*All quotations are given in inverted commas, but references are given only to Dr. Schweitzer's works: *The Decay and Restoration of Civilisation* (as I) and *Civilisation and Ethics* (as II). Both published in 1923. Further guidance on the subject of this review will be found in his *Christianity and the Religions of the World* (Allen and Unwin. 1923. 3/6).

absolutely and luminously self-evident beings—myself and my Creator.' Similarly, Dr. Schweitzer starts from two and two only self-evident existences, viz., himself and the world outside him. Unlike Newman, he does not ignore the reality for us of material phenomena, nor, like him and Dr. Barth, does he start his quest from and through theology. Nor, again, does he seek his world-theory through metaphysics, 'a fatal mistake, which has already had too long a currency in our Western thought' (II, p. iv). Descartes said: 'I think, therefore I exist'; Dr. Schweitzer says: 'I exist, for I am will-to-live,' and 'it is not any kind of insight into the nature of the world which determines my relation to my own existence and to the existence I encounter in the world, but solely my own will-to-live, which has developed the power of reflection about itself and the world' (I, xiv). This reflecting-will finds itself in a material world which is not Mosaic but Darwinian, and which no longer invites to an optimistic interpretation and an optimistic world-theory. From the ethical point of view the world, as described by science, is a chaos of unlimited destruction and unlimited reproduction, and can give no meaning to the aims and ends of human activities.

This, however, does not mean that our only refuge is a despairing scepticism, and an entirely pessimistic view of life, as if, because our life is in the world, it depends on the world, and must be as aimless as the latter is. Our world-theory, whether optimistic or pessimistic, is the result of our thought, and 'our view of life is not dependent on it, as uncritical thought supposes. It does not wither away when it cannot send down its roots into a corresponding view of the world. Neither is it derived from intellectual knowledge, much as it would like to find a basis in this. It can stand by itself perfectly well, for it is rooted in our will-to-live. World- and life-affirmation and ethics are all given in our will-to-live' (II, xiii).

Putting aside, therefore, the attempt which Western thought has been making ever since Descartes' day to arrive at an intellectual comprehension of the world by which we may interpret our life, and answering as simply as possible, without metaphysics or theology, the question: 'What is the relation of my will-to-live, when it has become conscious and reflective, to itself and to the objective world?' we say: 'Through the inner necessity to be true to itself, and to remain consistent with itself, our will-to-live enters into a relation with itself and with every other will-to-live that surrounds it, which is determined by the disposition to reverence for life. Reverence for life is the most direct and the most profound achievement of my will-to-live' (II, xv), and in it my knowledge passes into experience. Feeling, too, the value of my own life, I acknowledge the same in others, and thought finds there a basis for morality; a code of ethics grows up, based on reverence for life, and through it there runs inevitably the golden thread of the Golden Rule.

Have we not here, then, a basis for thought and ethics from which we can also build up a new theological scheme which shall be more consistent than the current one with to-day's knowledge of the world? We want to deliver the world from the reactionary stupidities of Fundamentalism, and, on the other hand, to avoid such extravagances of primitive and mediaeval *à priori* reasoning as provoked the satire of Anatole France in *Penguin Island*. And if theology is still to be called the 'Queen of the Sciences,' we must start, as all science does, from known facts of experience. Primaeval man did so, it is true, when he built up his strange mixture of magic and custom, but we shall start constructing our scheme of 'natural' religion with much greater knowledge and a much better trained judgment than he could employ.

We shall start with the conviction that 'all life is one,' and that there is one source of it behind phenomena. But we shall not dogmatize as to whether that source is One Personal Being, and the Creator, in the old sense, though we shall be sure that we are, each one of us, in vital connexion with it. The certainty, again, will not be the same for us all, but will admit of varying degrees of intimacy according to the varying depths of our moral and religious experience, as A. H. Clough truly wrote:

'O only Source of all our light and life,
Whom as our truth, our strength, we see and feel,
But whom the hours of mortal moral strife
Alone aright reveal.'

C. T. Campion.

FIVE DEANS.*

Mr. Sidney Dark, the Editor of the *Church Times*, has the first qualification needful in a journalist—he is interesting. We may feel when he treats historical personages that he is sometimes hazy as to the background: we may find ourselves disagreeing violently with his criticisms and *obiter dicta*: but he is always eminently readable. His latest book, consisting of studies, rather than biographies, of John Colet, John Donne, Jonathan Swift, Arthur Penrhyn Stanley, William Ralph Inge, is his best.

Deans as a body are not popular persons in Anglo-Catholic circles. They are believed, with rare exceptions, to be academic, Erastian, unenthusiastic, flaccid Churchmen. 'No dogmas, no Deans' was Disraeli's reminder addressed to the least dogmatic of all the tribe—Dean Stanley. Yet the Deans of the English Church since the Reformation, if we reckon in those who afterwards became Bishops, have included many notable men in their ranks—but the most notable of all did not become Bishops: they died Deans. Of these Mr. Dark has selected the most notable. We could wish, however, that he had made his studies six, and had included a full study of Dean Church—a better subject than either Dean Hook or Dean Hole.

The study of Colet, who 'stood for learning, piety, and the Catholic faith,' contributes nothing original, and is, as the summary cited indicates, somewhat one-sided. Mr. Dark says nothing to evince Colet's contempt for mediaeval scholastic theology. Dean Inge's summary, cited by Mr. Dark, stresses what ought to be stressed in Colet.

> 'He stands for a combination of Humanism and Christian austerity in morals, for Liberalism in theology combined with reverence for the great philosophical tradition.'

John Donne is treated with insight and justice. Here Mr. Dark's summary is much to the point:

> 'It is indeed as an artist, and as an artist alone, that Donne is worthy of remembrance.'

To our knowledge of Jonathan Swift little original is contributed. He doubts whether Swift ever married Stella.

> 'It is quite certain that he had no desire for marriage.' 'Swift preferred women friends to men friends because they were more easily bullied.' 'Jonathan Swift was a mass of contradictions, and the contradictions were so mingled that life for him was a heartbreaking adventure.'

Mr. Dark is quite naturally not very enthusiastic about *A Tale of a Tub*. Swift's coarse jibes at the Papacy and Catholic customs offend the Editor of the *Church Times*. He comments:—

**Five Deans.* By Sidney Dark. (Jonathan Cape. London, 1928. Price 7/6.)

'Swift wrote in this way because he was a sceptic in a cassock, believing little himself, resenting other people's faith, and joying in the coarsest and most violent bludgeoning.'

This criticism would probably be approved by Queen Anne, but betrays a lack of humour and insight.

It is in his treatment of Dean Stanley and Dean Inge that Mr. Dark is at his best; this is because he here knows his background so much better than in the case of the other Deans.

'Stanley may be regarded as the first and perhaps the most distinguished exponent of the doctrine that the Church of England should be comprehensive as well as established.'

The claims of Archbishop Tillotson, who preceded Stanley by two centuries, should be recognised. 'To Stanley and to his disciples . . . the words "comprehensive" and "established" hast a far greater significance and importance than the words "Catholic" and "Apostolic." Perhaps it may be because they are less elusive; we know better what they mean. "Catholic" and "Apostolic" are Protean and chameleonic terms.'

Dr. Arnold's powerful influence over Stanley is duly recognised. Mr. Dark informs us that Arnold dreamed of a Church which should include all Protestant Christians, joined together by a common hatred of Eucharistic doctrine and other Popish superstitions. His position, which Stanley shared with some modifications, was very much that which is held to-day by the Dean of St. Paul's and the Bishop of Birmingham.'

Mr. Dark records the vigorous Church policy of Queen Victoria. She did all in her power to promote Liberal Protestantism. In 1873 she wrote to Stanley:

'The Queen *now* turns with much anxiety to the *very* pressing question of the *state* of the *English* Church; its Romanizing tendencies which she fears are on the increase, its relations with other Protestant Churches, and the *universal struggle*, which has begun between the Roman Catholic Church and Protestant Governments in general. . . . But as regards the English Church . . . she thinks a *complete Reformation* is what we want. . . .

The Queen states all these points very crudely to the Dean, as her mind is greatly occupied with the state of the Church of England, and with the terrible amount of *bigotry* and *self-sufficiency* and *contempt* of all *other Protestant Churches*, of which she had some *incredible* instances the other day. The English Church should bethink itself of its dangers from *Papacy*, and should stretch out its arms to other Protestant Churches. . . . For the time is coming, if not come, when *something will have* to be done, or—the Church will *fall*.'

Disraeli and Gladstone were not of her way of thinking. It was only with much pressure that she secured the elevation of Tait to the Primacy. Disraeli opposed his elevation in the following letter to the Queen:

'Acknowledging his abilities and virtues, Mr. Disraeli finds him, as an Ecclesiastical statesman, obscure in purpose, fitful and inconsistent in action, and evidently, though earnest and conscientious, a prey to constantly conflicting convictions . . .

This is to be observed of the Bishop of London, that, though apparently of a spirit somewhat austere, there is in his idiosyncracy a strange fund of enthusiasm, a quality which ought never to be possessed by an Archbishop of Canterbury, or a Prime Minister of England. The Bishop of London sympathizes with everything that is earnest; but what is earnest is not always true; on the contrary, error is often more earnest than truth.'

Archbishop Tait wrote of Stanley:

> 'No clergyman, perhaps, who ever lived, exercised over the public at large, and especially over the literary and thoughtful portion of it, so fascinating an influence as Stanley.'

Among the pall-bearers at his funeral were Matthew Arnold, Jowett, the President of the Royal Society, Temple, Westcott and W. H. Smith.

Mr. Dark's study of Dean Inge is marked by more daring than insight. The following extract will interest Modernists:

> 'It was once said with a measure of wit that the late Dr. Rashdall, the Modernist Dean of Carlisle, was not a Christian and was sorry, and that Dean Inge was a Christian and was sorry too. In so far as he is a Christian his Christianity is a brand of his own. He is one of the most distinguished of the small eclectic body who call themselves Modern Churchmen. . . . But even in this small and select circle Dr. Inge retains his characteristic loneliness.'
>
> 'Dean Inge tells us that the special work assigned to the Church of England would seem to be the development of a Johannine Christianity, which shall be both Catholic and Evangelical without being either Roman or Protestant.'

We find Mr. Dark's comment on this most illuminating: 'I confess that to me this is absolutely meaningless.' It makes the darkness visible.

H.D.A.M.

EARLY CHRISTIAN DOGMATICS.*

This treatise is undoubtedly one of the most important contributions to the history of dogmatic theology which has been produced since the War. The contributors which Dr. A. E. J. Rawlinson has secured for it are, with one exception, past or present teachers of theology in Oxford. The editor himself opens the volume with an essay on the Hebrew background of Christianity; Mr. F. D. V. Narborough contributes an essay on the life of Christ; Mr. A. D. Nock, of Clare College, Cambridge, comes next with a learned article on the Hellenistic background of early Christianity; two essays, by Dr. K. E. Kirk, the present Bampton Lecturer, and Mr. F. W. Green, deal with the history of Trinitarian doctrine in the earlier Patristic period; Mr. F. H. Brabant contributes two essays, the one historical, which discusses the relation of Augustine to Plotinus, and the other philosophical, treating of the relation of God to the time process; Mr. L. Hodgson concludes the volume with a philosophical study of the Incarnation. All the essays provoke thought, and many of them questionings. But we will confine our attention here solely to those of Dr. Kirk and Mr. Green, which are the most striking. These two essays cover much the same ground, but from completely different standpoints, so the essays hardly overlap at all.

Dr. Kirk's main thesis is that the Trinitarian doctrine to which the Church ultimately became committed was reached only as the result of a long history, and that there were times in the ante-Nicene period when the Church seemed to be steering straight for Binitarianism, as opposed to Trinitarianism. There is little support in the New Testament for an explicit Trinitarianism.

> 'Read in the light of the later faith of the Church, (the New Testament) presents an almost explicit Trinitarianism. Read apart from that light—as modern theology attempts to read it—it presents an almost inextricable confusion of ideas' (p. 199).

**Essays on the Trinity and the Incarnation.* By Members of the Anglican Commission. Edited by A. E. J. Rawlinson, D.D. (Longmans. 1928. Price 21/-.)

This confusion is largely the result of the birth-pangs of the twin doctrines, Binitarianism and Trinitarianism. The word trinity (τριάς) did not appear in Christian theology until the latter half of the Second Century; and it is noteworthy that Theophilus of Antioch, who first used it, conceived of the Trinity as consisting of the Father, the Logos, and the Wisdom of God. Dr. Kirk concludes from his historical survey

> '. . . that what Bishop Gore calls "a hitherto unheard-of doctrine of Duality" was, as a matter of fact, a conventional form of thought in Christian circles of the second, third and fourth centuries, existing alongside a parallel tendency towards Trinitarianism which ultimately triumphed in the fourth century' (p. 218).

The concluding part of the essay contains an attempt to justify the Church's preference for Trinitarianism over Binitarianism. Dr. Kirk realises the difficulty; and the suggestion which he makes—that Christian experience of God takes three different forms—is not very convincing. The really important thing from the philosophical point of view is the 'multipersonal' character of God; this belief guarantees the permanence of individuality without sacrificing Monotheism. Whether God is conceived of as Bipersonal or Tripersonal is a matter of comparative unimportance. Dr. Kirk at times inclines to the view of the Angelic Doctor, that the solution of this problem lies beyond the limits of human reason.

In some ways Mr. Green's contribution is even more challenging to current ideas than is Dr. Kirk's. He draws out the difference between the Alexandrian and the Antiochene modes of approach to the doctrine of the Trinity—or perhaps to the doctrine of the Divine Sonship, for he agrees with Dr. Kirk in the Binitarian tendency in the early Church. The Alexandrians held a doctrine of God *of* God, the Antiochenes a doctrine of God *in* God. Following Loofs (on whom he is particularly dependent), he sums up the Alexandrian tradition with the formula 'Pluralistic-Monophysite' (p. 257 n.), the Antiochene tradition with the formula 'Economic-Dyophysite' (p. 258 n.). Alexandrianism always tended in a polytheistic direction, and Origen's theology found its nemesis in Arianism (though Origen himself was saved by his doctrine of Eternal Generation); the complement of this polytheistic theology was a simplification of the Christological problem (*e.g.* the Arian Christology). Of the Antiochene school, Paul of Samosata is a typical representative. Loofs has produced a treatise on Paul which Harnack has described as the freshest and most stimulating work on the history of dogma in the last decade; and, following the exposition of Paul's theology given by Loofs, Mr. Green attempts to clear Paul of heresy, at least in his Trinitarian teaching.

> 'It is possible to accuse Paul of christological heresy; it is no longer possible to accuse him of heresy in regard to his teaching about the Trinity' (p. 261).

Mr. Green's interpretation of the correspondence between the Dionysii (A.D. 260) is also interesting. He challenges the usual view that the two theologians were attempting to express what were in essence identical views in different terminology. He is inclined to think (p. 257) that the mantle of heresy which fell upon Paul of Samosata belonged really to Dionysius of Alexandria.

All the writers except the last two seem thoroughly familiar with the German literature on their respective subjects. Mr. Nock's acquaintance with it is particularly great. The book is well produced, but it has a large number of misprints, which we hope will be corrected when it enters its second edition. Z.

THE DECLINE OF FAITH.

The April issue of the *Edinburgh Review* contains an interesting article by Mr. Wyatt Tilby with the above title. The writer describes the precarious position now occupied by the churches, faced as they are by a growing indifferentism and scepticism. The situation is not the result of an active propaganda, such as that conducted by the French Encyclopaedists, but of a prevalent uncertainty, unsettlement, and restlessness. In Mr. Tilby's view, the churches are more likely to die from inanition than to succumb to any onslaughts from without; the life is being drained ont of them from within. They have, in fact, lost touch with the current of life and knowledge, and their authority has declined in consequence.

> 'Authority in religion can only rest ultimately on superior knowledge; and this is precisely the difficulty of the churches, that they have so long relied on an authority which has now deserted them, and shown themselves reluctant to recognise any truth which conflicts with their own claims to inerrancy. Institutions, like men, may love tradition dearly, but in the long run they must serve the truth or perish.'

Mr. Tilby evidently looks to the Church of England to initiate and establish the *entente* between religion and culture which is so essential to the survival of either.

> 'It is, I think, no idle boast of the Church of England that—probably owing to some fortunate accidents of situation and constitution—it has been less prone than any other religious body except the Quakers to assert itself by force, and less unready to accept the results of new learning in other fields than its own . . . Its clergy are not unready to profit from experience, and on the whole they share the prevailing temper of our nation, which prefers persuasion to persecution, and would sooner assimilate than destroy. The Church of England is, or at least has been in the past, more flexible and more susceptible to external influences than other ecclesiastical organisations; and, provided always that it can recruit itself from a fairly intellectual stock, it should be in a peculiarly favourable position to assume something like the mental leadership of Christendom in the difficult times ahead, when the churches are faced with the necessity of reconstructing their whole theological scheme if they are to retain, or rather to regain, the support of thinking men.'

Mr. Tilby's remarks may, we opine, be taken as typical of the views of a good many competent, but more or less detached, observers. Such men are in the habit of noting tendencies, they mingle with the world, and their eyesight is unimpaired either by the mists of idealistic frenzy or the gloom of theological prejudice. It is to be hoped that our Bishops and the Principals of our Theological Colleges will peruse their *Edinburgh Review* for April.

J.C.H.

A NEW METHOD OF GOSPEL STUDY.*

Professor Easton's book on the Gospels should prove very useful to English-reading students of the New Testament because of its exposition of the latest kind of criticism—namely, Form-criticism. Like much original work in the sphere of Biblical studies, it has come to us from Germany.

*The Gospel before the Gospels. By Burton Scott Easton, D.D. (Charles Scribner's Sons, New York. 1928. Price $1.75.)

M. Dibelius brought out his *Die Formegeschichte des Evangeliums* in 1919; R. K. Bultmann's *Die Geschichte der synoptischen Tradition* appeared in 1921; E. Fascher's *Die formesgeschichtliche Methode* in 1924.

What is this latest child of literary criticism? The term Form-history is derived from folk-lore terminology. It describes the history of certain pre-literary forms not consciously created by individuals, but developed by the force of constant oral repetition. 'If,' writes Professor Easton, 'we amass folk-tales and popular traditions in sufficient numbers, we find that we can class them into certain more or less well-defined groups, according to their forms; and form-history is the study of these groups. The Synoptic material, obviously, offers a tempting field to the form historian, for here we undoubtedly have the product of an oral tradition little controlled by conscious literary art.'

Of course there have been many unconscious or even semi-conscious form-historians, but with Dibelius form-history, as Dr. Easton points out, is raised to the rank of 'a distinct discipline, with rules of its own that make it competent to pronounce not only literary but historical judgments; in his hands "form-history" becomes "form criticism."'

The first purpose of the form-historian at work on a story is to determine its relation to the life of the community which framed it. The Gospel stories were produced by the primitive Christian Church in order to secure and instruct converts. These stories, then, are an early form of primitive Christian preaching—the preaching of the Gentile Mission. Dibelius believes the earlier Jewish-Christian message to be usually irrecoverable. In the *Acts* we have examples of primitive Christian preaching. These, it is pointed out, all exhibit three well-marked divisions: a positive message (*kerugma*), an argument from prophecy, and an exhortation to repentance. The Gospel stories, then, should be studied according to Dibelius, as *units employed in mission preaching*. Most of these units are brief. The passion and resurrection unit is an exception. These units Dibelius calls 'paradigms.' Originally they were independant, but the Evangelists have grouped them together into continuous narratives, and in so doing have introduced editorial notes and other modifications, so that we rarely find a paradigm in its earliest form.

Now here a very real task offers itself to the serious student of the Gospels. It is his function, in the light of their form-history, to recover the paradigms in their pure state. Schmiedel found only *nine* 'pillar-passages' in the Gospels; Dibelius recovers from Mark only *seven* paradigms in their earliest form. The Marcan paradigms are very concise. Everything in the paradigm is made subordinate to a central saying of Jesus, which is the 'kernel' of the paradigm, and this kernel-saying invariably possesses universal application. Elements in a paradigm that are needless for the lesson are to be viewed as later additions.

The 'paradigm' according to Dibelius was not the only form of the Gospel sections. There is the 'story.' Dibelius finds *eight* of these in Mark. For the most part they are vivid miracle-narratives. Another form according to Dibelius is the 'legend,' and another the 'epiphany,' and yet another the 'myth.'

The reader may find much that is suggestive in the form-history method, but as a shrewd man he will accept it in its full developed form, as we have it, for instance, in Bultmann, *cum grano salis*. Thoroughness is a characteristic of the modern Teutonic student, and this leads to over-precision and excessive rigidity. If the canons of form-criticism be grasped, and if they be applied, not slavishly, but are, to use Sir Joshua's phrase, 'mixed with brains,' they will give valuable results in Gospel-study.

We commend Dr. Easton's book very heartily to serious students of the Gospels. He has done a real service to English readers by introducing them to this latest German contribution to Gospel criticism.

We ought to add that the book consists (with bibliography) of only 170 small pages. The style is lucid and the matter well-arranged—evidently the work of a first-class teacher. H.D.A.M.

CORRESPONDENCE

CHRISTIANITY AND HISTORY.

SIR,

In his article on this subject, the Rev. C. J. Wright makes abundantly evident the utter confusion, intricacy and futility of mixing up religion with history—two incongruous topics, as he himself points out. But when he admits that history is not religion, he gives away his own case for the credibility of the combination of the two in what is called Historical Christianity. If Christianity is a form of religion, which I hold it is, then as it concerns the soul there is no history in it. The appearance of history which is found allied with it, cannot be other than adventitious, and most probably is allegory. What I mean is, that the theory of allegory is the most consistent theory to accept, unless confirmative proof of the theory of history is found outside the New Testament: but such proof is entirely lacking, as we all know.

The immense advantage of seeing in the Gospels allegory instead of history is twofold. First, the whole narration becomes explainable by one consistent theory which requires no rejection of any part of the Gospel story. The stories of the Virgin Birth, the Temptation, etc., become just as easy to understand as any other of the stories. All the troublesome difficulties which beset Mr. Wright and other historical theorists disappear entirely. Second, the doctrine of inspiration is restored to its pristine significance, and the religious element in the Scriptures is immensely enhanced through the disappearance of the non-religious intricacies, confusions and disputations of history, a supposed record of events impossible to test for truth and accuracy.

Mr. Wright, I find, never discusses fundamentals, either in his last article or in its predecessor. He always at the outset takes for granted that Jesus was historical, which is the centre-point of dispute. He fails to see the necessity of proving the truth of his leading idea. He is dialectically like a man who asserts that there is a great hole in the reverse of the moon, and then, as no one can dispute his assertion, holds it as true! We cannot investigate the past any more than we can explore the other side of the moon. But Mr. Wright appears to think that we have 'the whole reality' of Christian history before us (p. 79) to abstract from it just what suits the purpose of Christian historians. Could anything be more absurdly untrue? What we really have before us are extremely slender records of a few past events, never likely to be accurate in detail, and in many cases entirely unreliable. From this mass of dubious statements we have to form our beautifully worded, easy flowing, plausible histories, which, unfortunately, must be equally as unreliable as their sources.

Even if we assume the Gospels to be historical, modern scholars find them full of inaccuracies, doubtful statements, and entirely untrue assertions, which completely envelop in doubt the truth of the remaining con-

tent. I utterly repudiate the notion that our great religion is in any degree founded, as Mr. Wright thinks (p. 86), on the shifting sands of history—'the doubtful story of successive events.'

I may be better understood if I explain my position in Christian thought. I am not of the Christ-myth school, but logically a Modernist. The Birth and Temptation stories were a time back materialized in the physical sense; they are now dematerialized by Modernists, together with a score of other stories. I am a Modernist in principle for the very good reason that I carry out the principle of Modernism to its logical conclusion. The mode of criticism which present-day scholars apply *partially* to the Gospels and Acts, I apply *wholly*. A dematerialized Resurrection is an easy step to a dematerialized Crucifixion, and then the story of Jesus would be fully spiritualized.

In religion there is no place for materialism. Our Lord is not in a special physical body at the present time, and so it can be no loss to us if we cease to believe that He ever was in such a body. Indeed, it would comfort our *unselfish* feelings to be assured that the agonising tortures and death of a kind-hearted man never took place, as asserted. Selfish folk would, of course, rejoice that Jesus suffered and died, if they believed that they stood to profit by the cruelty of the events. It is well to face exactly what is meant by a 'historical religion' which claims to be founded upon the fact of the crucifixion of a living man on a fiendish instrument of torture. When Modernism has completed its work, the Incarnation of Christ will be understood in all its beauty, and there will be an end of all hideous nightmares of the soul.

Referring now more particularly to the article on *The Problem of Jesus* by Mr. Wright (April, 1927), I have to point out that he begins his argument by calmly *begging the question at issue*, which is the historicity of Jesus. He writes:

> 'The message and life of the historic Jesus are essential to a right understanding, etc. . . . Jesus has been a historically determining factor.'

This ruling position of Jesus is adhered to throughout his article when dealing with the statements of those who cannot find *evidence* of any kind that Jesus had existed physically 'as a historical founder of Christianity.'

It is just this historically required evidence, if there is any, that has *first* to be set forth in argument. But Mr. Wright apparently does not see the need for taking this difficult first step, so he shirks it by *assuming that Jesus had existed*—the very point in dispute for which his opponents require evidence.

On the ground of this foregone conclusion, Mr. Wright very effectively disposes of all the criticism of those who think evidence is wanting for a belief in a physical Jesus of the Gospels. He triumphs over the enemy at the first onset!

However, near the end of his article he seems called upon to show why he himself believes in a historical Jesus, and, behold, we find that he relies, not on his much-vaunted history, but entirely on *sentiment*. Jesus, he says, 'has the stamp of a great historical creative personality.' Therefore He must have existed, he thinks!

He then dilates on 'the great weakness of the mythologists' who attend so little to 'the labours of recent scholars,' who, I say, start their labours by believing, as he does, on sentimental and traditional grounds, that Jesus is historical! I think it incontestable that scholars often waste their energy on lines of thought that afterwards are proved to be untrue.

Mr. Wright's dealings with non-Christian witnesses are obviously strained to suit the historicity theory. Referring to the significant silence of Philo, he assures his readers that 'there is nothing to prove that Christianity had reached Alexandria before this date (A.D. 40)' (or the contrary, either!) This intelligent remark conveniently belittles the silence; but Mr. G. R. S. Mead, a great scholar and student of Christian origins, writes:

> 'Here, then, we have a man (Philo) in just the position to know what was going on in the world of philosophy, of letters, and religion, and not only in Alexandria, but also wherever Jewish enterprise—which had then, as it now has, the main commerce of the world in its hands—pushed. The news of the world came to Alexandria.' (*T. G. Hermes,* Vol. I, p. 204.)

Another writer on another subject writes:

> 'Alexandria was the place where first and most completely the connection of Greece with the East was brought about. In that centre of commerce for all parts of the globe, East and West entered into a connection more intimate and more lasting than in any other centre.' (Dr. E. Zeller, *Stoics, etc.,* p. 28.)

Mr. Wright refers confidently to the 'familiar reference of Tacitus,' but he is careful not to mention the fact that nothing was heard of this precious reference until it appeared *in print* in 1468, and that the Neronian persecution (A.D. 64) described therein is open to grave doubt. Forgery is suspected, in that the early Fathers and Eusebius, well-acquainted as they were with pagan writings, never allude to this interesting statement in Tacitus, which they would have been so glad to discover.

I might go on criticizing Mr. Wright's ambitious article, but I think I have said enough to show how faulty is his reasoning and biased are his statements. He may be assured that the theory he disparages and *does not face* has not 'disappeared into the limbo of forgotten things.' However, some theories have a way of disappearing, through being accepted as true by the intelligence of a liberalised Christianity:—this theory may be one of them.

If the view prevailed that the Gospel Jesus meant exactly the same Being as the Jesus of the Epistles—'the image of the invisible God' incarnate in every human soul—what difference could it make to our religion, except that the wearisome incumbrance of much disputed history is forever cast off? I can see no essential difference. To put away the materialism of the old view would indeed be the Resurrection of Jesus in our minds and hearts, for He would rise in truth and wisdom from the tomb of dead history.

G. A. GASKELL.

SIR,

Some few words might seem to be called for in answer to the long letter from Mr. Gaskell. There are two distinct issues: (1) the question of the historicity or non-historicity of Jesus, and (2) the question of the relation of Christianity to History.

(1) The first is a question of fact, and has to be answered by the methods of historical enquiry. The two presumed 'immense advantages' of the non-historical view to which your correspondent refers are *theories,* and not facts. Theories have to conform to the facts, and not *vice versa.* (*a*) The 'one consistent theory' for explaining the Gospel narratives may,

or may not, be an 'advantage.' The real question is, Does it accord with the facts? In my own view it does not. (*b*) Likewise, the restoration of 'the doctrine of inspiration to its pristine significance' may, or may not, be desirable. The real question is, What are the facts? The historical enquirer cannot accommodate his conclusions to a theory—whether, on the one hand, to a theory which requires complete and consistent historicity, or, on the other hand, to a theory which requires complete and consistent non-historicity.

My suggested dialectical resemblance to a man 'who asserts that there is a great hole in the reverse of the moon I find interesting. Is not the resemblance between your correspondent and a man who denies the existence of the moon altogether?

Mr. Gaskell thinks it 'would comfort our unselfish feelings' to be assured that a historical Jesus did not die on a cross. Again, whether there is 'comfort' or no in this theory of a 'dematerialized crucifixion' might be discussed, but it has nothing to do with the question of *fact* which is at issue. Though, for myself, I do not find this 'comfort' in history. I find, on the contrary, that the sufferings of the righteous and truth-loving are inescapable facts; and I have never discovered any 'comfort' in eluding the facts of life.

With reference to the Tacitus quotation, your correspondent suspects forgery. I do not know if he accepts the generally-repudiated theory that the *Annals* were forged in the fifteenth century by Poggio Bracciolini, or whether the forgery is confined to the specific passage at issue. The discussion of this passage would require an article. Reinach, who will not be suspected of apologetic bias, says of the passage 'The authenticity of these lines has been questioned, but quite groundlessly.' (*Orpheus*, Eng. tr., p. 227.)

(2) With respect to the second question, your correspondent seems unable to distinguish the following two statements: *history is not religion*, and *religion has nothing to do with history*. The latter seems to him to follow from the former. In face of this inability it seems futile on my part to add words to words.

C. J. WRIGHT.

BISHOPS, MIRACLES, AND ORDINANDS.

SIR,

It is to be hoped that all clergy, old and young, whose ordination was a time of fiery trial will be grateful for your article on 'Bishops, Miracles, and Ordinands.'

At the end of Dr. Schweitzer's book, *On the Edge of the Primeval Forest*, the author, writing of the call to medical work in distant lands, says: 'He who has been delivered from pain must not think he is now free again, and at liberty to take up life just as it was before, entirely forgetful of the past.' We may well apply these words to those who have suffered pain in mind and conscience at the time of their ordination. Too often ordinands are left to fight their own battle without the help of those clergy whose scars have grown so old as to cease to recall their own Crispin's day. As one who still feels the scars, may I say three things?

1. I have found the argument that parochial work will solve difficulties about miracles as untrue in practical experience as I imagined it to be when put to me before ordination. Visiting, preaching, teaching, taking funerals and weddings, has not changed my view on the Virgin Birth and the Empty Tomb.

2. The authorities draw a distinction between the ordinand who says 'I cannot give assent to this miracle,' and the one who says 'I do not believe this miracle to be true.' Such distinctions without difference do not encourage honesty.

3. Truth of character, which alone matters in the sight of God, is independent of belief in or denial of miracles. To-day truth of character is put at a discount owing to the Church's insistence on credal tests for ordinands.

The present state of things can only be changed if all who have had a difficult time at ordination and have won their freedom will remember the debt they owe to the ordinands who come after them. The Church may be right to restrain the impetuosity of her young men: she can ill afford to tamper with their honesty.

ROY MCKAY.

Kingston-on-Thames.

1st June, 1928.

SIR,

WOMEN AND THE MINISTRY.

With reference to the editorial comments in the April *Modern Churchman* on the exclusion of the service for the Making and Ordering of Deaconesses from the Revised Prayer Book, some of your readers feel quite unconvinced that its exclusion may not be for the ultimate good of the Church and the Deaconesses who minister therein. We cannot see why the existing service for the Ordination of the Deacon cannot be used, with alteration of pronouns and such modifications as are necessary by the (at present) limitation of function of the Deaconess.

Then, with regard to the suggestion that women's ministrations should be for their own sex alone, does not Canon Raven deal adequately with that point when he says:

> 'The fact of womanhood, far from being a hindrance, is an actual help, since many men respond to the spiritual influence of a woman who are indifferent to the ministry of their own sex. . . Sex so used is seen as what it is, a gift of God for the purifying and enriching of His children'?

Could not the Churchmen's Union consider advocacy of the recognition by the Church (in practice as well as in theory) of the spiritual equality of women and men in the sacred ministry? It has not been considerd, I believe, as one of the planks of the Union. Has not the time come now for the question to be faced?

E. LOUIE ACRES,
Chairman.

League of the Church Militant.

22nd May, 1928.

A CORRECTION.

In our April issue (p. 3) we stated that the present number of Jesuits in the English Province is 3,337. *English Province* ought to be *English Assistancy*. We took the statement from *Evangile et Liberté:*

'L'ordre des *jésuites* comptait au début de 1927 20,107 membres . . . Les six provinces de l'ordre comprennent: province italienne 1,679 . . . anglaise 3,337. Dans les Missions de l'ordre: 2,305.'

Fr. Woodlock and others have stated that these figures refer to Jesuit Assistancies, and not Provinces.—ED., M.C.